DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 197 501 EA 013 549

AUTHOR Rosenblum, Sheila: Jastrzab, JoAnn
TITLE The Role of the Principal in Change. The Teacher Corps Example.
INSTITUTION Abt Associates, Inc., Cambridge, Mass.
SPONS AGENCY Department of Education, Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO AAI-80-100a
PUB DATE 80
CONTRACT 300-79-0593
NOTE 88p.: For a related document, see EA 013 550. Prepared for the Teacher Corps.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Role: Case Studies: *Educational Change: Educational Innovation: Elementary Secondary Education: Federal Programs: *Principals: Program Descriptions: Program Implementation
IDENTIFIERS Teacher Corps

ABSTRACT

To understand better the role a principal plays in the success or failure of a federal program, this study was conducted of the role of principals in Teacher Corps projects. An introductory chapter discusses the changing role of the principal in general and the role of the principal in change efforts and then more specifically discusses the emergent role of principals in Teacher Corps projects. Next comes a synthesis of case studies of four Teacher Corps projects and an analysis of factors affecting the role of principals in the projects, with implications for policy makers, project managers, and principals themselves. One appendix briefly describes the methodology for conducting the case studies and a cross-site analysis. The other consists of two commentary chapters written by experts in the fields of educational administration and school change who reviewed the case studies and synthesis chapter and, drawing on their own disciplinary perspective and experience, made recommendations for program improvement and training. A companion volume applies the lessons learned from this study to training materials for administrator inservice education. (Author/JM)

The Role of the Principal in Change

The Teacher Corps Example

Sheila Rosenblum
JoAnn Jastrzab
with
Nancy Brigham
Donald Phillips

Prepared for:
Department of Education
Teacher Corps
Washington, D.C. 20202

Prepared by:
Abt Associates Inc.
55 Wheeler Street
Cambridge, MA 02138

This material was produced pursuant to Contract Number 300-79-0593 between Abt Associates Inc. and the Teacher Corps, Department of Education. Points of view or opinions stated here do not necessarily represent official positions or policy of the Department of Education.

AAI No.: 80-100a

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PREFACE

A common thread runs through educational research literature: the principal is the key to change. Much less clear from the literature, however, is exactly what principals do (or do not do) to carry out their role effectively, and what managers of change projects can do to involve principals more effectively. The lack of more specific knowledge about skills, tactics, and strategies exists at a time when many principals are facing dramatic changes in their roles and responsibilities (Mangers, 1978). Among other things, the authority of the principal is increasingly shared with decision-making councils which include teachers, parents, or even students; teachers are exerting considerable pressure to control working conditions at local sites; the public is demanding more explicit evidence that shows that educational programs are having desired impacts; and federal programs and/or externally managed programs for change are increasingly present in schools.

While the importance of the principals' role in change is widely acknowledged, some educational improvement programs build in a formal role for principals, others do not. The principal can influence greatly the success of a program in his/her school, but there can also be deterrents to that role. Deterrents may be structural, personal, or inherent in a program design.

In order to understand better the role a principal plays in the success (or failure) of a federal program, the National Teacher Corps awarded a contract to Abt Associates Inc. to conduct a study of the Role of Principals in Teacher Corps Projects. A further objective was to apply the lessons learned from the study in a set of training materials that can be used by Teacher Corps projects and other individuals or institutions interested in administrator in-service education for the improvement of educational practices.

The results of that contract have been prepared in two parts. Part One, this volume, is a report of the study of the role of the principal in Teacher Corps. It consists of the following sections:

- An introductory chapter which first discusses general issues related to the changing role of principals and the role of the principal in change and then more specifically discusses the emergent role of principals in Teacher Corps;
- A synthesis of case studies of four Teacher Corps projects and an analysis of factors affecting the role of principals in the projects, with implications for policy makers, project managers, and principals themselves;
- An appendix which briefly describes the methodology for conducting the case studies and performing the cross-site analysis; and
- An appendix with two commentary chapters written by experts in the fields of educational administration and school change who reviewed the case studies and synthesis and, drawing upon their own disciplinary perspective and experience, made recommendations for program improvement and for training.

Part Two, a companion volume to this report, is a Training Manual. Although originally planned as a manual for use in administrative in-service training, lessons learned from the case studies suggest that in order to foster the important role of principals in projects such as Teacher Corps, it is necessary to orient project staff and other participants to the change process as well. Thus, while the Training Manual focusses primarily on the principal, it can used potentially by all role groups in the educational improvement process.

Several people have contributed to this effort. The case studies were conducted by Sheila Rosenblum, JoAnn Jastrzab, Nancy Brigham and Donald Phillips, and this volume is a collaborative effort of all the authors. Further, Dr. Terrence E. Deal of the Harvard Graduate School of Education and Dr. James Olivero of the Association of California School Administrators, each of whom had as his primary responsibility the preparation of a commmentary chapter, also provided welcome counsel and support throughout the conduct of this project.

The volume benefited greatly from the editing skills of Sandy Margolin. Throughout the project Yevgenia Mackiernan contributed ideas, excellent adminsitrative support and careful supervision of report production.

Drafts of both parts of this report were helpfully reviewed by Dr. Kent Chabotar and Dr. Karen Seashore Louis of Abt Associates and by an

external review panel consisting of: Dr. Roland Barth, Harvard Graduate School of Education; Mr. Winston Turner, National Association of Elementary School Principals; Dr. Scott Thomson, National Association of Secondary School Principals; and Ms. Willie Butler, Winston Middle School, Baltimore, Maryland.

We are grateful for the support and encouragement of Velma Robinson, James Steffenson and Susan Melnick of the Teacher Corps Washington staff. And finally, we wish to express a special debt of gratitude to the school administrators, project directors and staff, school district and university personnel and community residents in the four Teacher Corps project sites we visited, who gave generously of their time for the purposes of this study.

THE CHANGING ROLE OF PRINCIPALS AND THE ROLE OF PRINCIPALS IN CHANGE

Support for education has traditionally been the responsibility of state and local government, but the federal role in education began to grow in the early 1950s. Many federally funded educational reforms in the 1960s and 1970s reflected a general concern with the needs of children who had been discriminated against on racial or economic grounds, and were designed to reduce inequities by enhancing educational opportunities for such children. The major federal entry in this regard was the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) in 1965 (and its subsequent amendments) which provided the bases of support for programs in compensatory education, innovative projects and bilingual education. Other legislation such as the Vocational Eduction Act originally passed in 1968 and the Emergency School Aid Act in 1972 (ESAA)--designed to aid school districts undergoing desegregation--are further examples of the increased role of federal support for educational improvement (Olivero, 1980).

Another avenue which the federal government took to foster school improvement was to provide support for educational professional development. To this end the National Teacher Corps Program was established as part of the Higher Education Act originally passed in 1965.

In the 1950s and 1960s, reforms of public education focussed many of their efforts on the central administration of local school systems. Whether it was fostering excellence, improving education for "the disadvantaged," or training educational staff, local school boards, superintendents and central office staff were thought to be the most effective agents for change (Brickell, 1961. Clark and Guba, 1967). The assumption was that central agencies could effectively direct the functioning in individual schools if only those agencies had enough money, or the right sort of staff, or better training, or the appropriate legislative mandate.

Many attempts at educational improvement failed, however, to meet their intended objectives, and the concept of the central agency as the agency for change has been seriously challenged by experience and research. Increasingly, the local school site is seen as the critical force for change and improvement, and one finding that consistently emerges in research

literature on educational change is the importance of the leadership and support of the building principal for effective schooling to take place and for any change to succeed (Berman and McLaughlin, 1978; Rosenblum and Louis, 1979; Mangers, 1978).

The proliferation of federally supported programs for change has added a new set of roles and responsibilities to the already complex and ambiguous role of school administrators. Aside from the ongoing organizational maintenance and educational leadership responsibilities principals have in the day-to-day management of their schools, federal programs bring with them special sets of project goals and legislative guidelines that both affect and are affected by the role the principal plays.

The degree to which a principal plays a role in affecting the implementation and outcomes of a categorical program in her/his school can vary, depending in part on the formal role that the principal is either given or assumes in the structure of a given project. Other factors--such as organizational context, personal and organizational history and leadership style--can affect the principal's influence as well. The purpose of this paper is to describe issues related to the role of principals in fostering the implementation of externally supported school improvement programs. While we are interested in this as a global question, we are particularly interested in the role principals play in the implementation of a specific federal program, that of Teachers Corps.

The Complexities of the Principal's Role

In order to understand the role of the principal in fostering school improvement, it is important to set the appropriate context and to emphasize that the principal's role is a very complex one. The principal plays a pivotal role in all aspects of a school's programs and activities. In 1979, the Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity of the United States Senate issued a report on the role of the school principal:

> In many ways the school principal is the most important and influential individual in any school. He or she is the person responsible for all activities that occur in and around the school building. It is the principal's leadership that sets the tone of the school, the climate for learning, the level of professionalism and morale of teachers and the degree of concern for what students may

> or may not become. The principal is the main link between the community and the school and the way he or she performs in this capacity largely determines the attitudes of parents and students about the school. If a school is a vibrant, innovative, child-centered place, if it has a reputation for excellence in teaching, if students are performing to the best of their ability, one can almost always point to the principal's leadership as the key to success.

Many have documented the evolution of the principalship as we know it today. (See, for example, Blumberg and Greenfield, 1980; Olivero, 1980.) The essential features of the principalship were established by the early 1900s and have not changed substantially since that time. While the complexities of the roles and responsibilities have grown, the expectation that principals will perform the dual functions of instructional leadership and school management has been firmly rooted.

There are numerous conceptions of the functions principals are expected to perform in their role of school manager and instructional leader. (See, for example, Weldy, 1978; Roe and Drake, 1974; Figure 1.) In performing all these roles principals also face the many problems and daily pressures of often competing images of what their role should be. Principals are expected to be "everything to everybody" and even the best have difficulty juggling the tasks of managing a smoothly running school and functioning as an educational leader and facilitator of instructional improvement.

Roe and Drake (1974) point out "that it is virtually impossible to assume that the principal can be a real instructional leader and at the same time be held strictly accountable for the general operation, management and management detail required by the central office" (p.14). As a result, the educational leadership emphasis is the one "that most principals profess they dream about but can't achieve."

Research on how principals spent their time affirms that a typical principal's day is long--generally lasting 9 1/2 hours (Gordon and McIntyre, 1978), but that much of the day is spent on attention to a myriad of little problems rather than on a grand design of what they hope to accomplish (Wolcott, 1973). Many of these tasks are of short duration, and although they are likely to include service to teachers and advice on procedures and

Figure 1.

Conceptualizations on the Functions of Principals

Dimensions of the Principal's Role (Weldy, 1978)	The Dual Emphasis of the Principal's Role (Roe and Drake, 1974)
• An Authority Figure - sets rules for studies, assigns and schedules them, as well as being the one person who can expel them. • An Advocate for Students - the principal must work vigorously in the school community for the best oportunities, programs and facilities for students. • An Educational Leader - principals are expected to demonstrate the leadership skills necessary to lead their faculty and students in pursuit of their schools' objectives. • An Acknowledged Expert - experts in the field of education and administration; although they cannot be expert in every subject area, they are expected to be in the teaching and learning process. • A Decision Maker - the decisionmaking process in the schools has evolved into one which is more participative that authoritarian --teachers, students, parents and frequently members of the community have some input into almost all major decisions that principals make. This participative process is often confusing and frightening to principals --a decision rarely seems "right" to all those affected. • A Problem Solver - since conflicts naturally arise the principal must call upon his skills as a mediator, compromiser and accommodator. Other problems may require extensive study and research, gathering of resources and calling consultants. • The Master Scheduler - the responsibility for developing the master schedule--the school plan that brings students and teachers together in appropriate places for instruction and educational activity. • The Disciplinarian - even if the principal may not be directly responsible for the administration of discipline within a school, s/he is directly involved in establishing the rules of behavior, the penalties to be applied, and the processes to be used. • The Goal Setter - a major responsibility for principals is keeping their schools goal-oriented and working toward accepted education goals. Other individuals--teachers, students, support staff--see only one aspect of the overall picture and, by focussing on those specific details, lose sight of the overall school's goals. The principal is responsible for reminding employees in the school of the purposes behind the school's existence.	Administrative-Managerial Emphasis 1. maintaining adequate school records of all types; 2. preparing reports for the central office and other agencies; 3. budget development and budget control; 4. personnel administration; 5. student discipline; 6. scheduling and maintaining a schedule; 7. building administration; 8. administering supplies and equipment; 9. pupil accounting; and 10. monitoring programs and instructional processes prescribed by the central office. Educational Leadership Emphasis 1. stimulating and motivating staff to maximum performance; 2. developing with the staff a realistic and objective system of accountability for learning (as contrasted to merely monitoring programs and instructional processes in input terms as prescribed by the central office); 3. developing cooperatively operable assessment procedures for ongoing programs to identify and suggest alternatives for improving weak areas; 4. working with staff to develop and implement the evaluation of the staff; 5. providing channels for the involvement of the community in the operation of the school; 6. encouraging continuous study of curricular and instructional innovations. 7. providing leadership to students to help them to develop a meaningful but responsible student government; and 8. establishing a professional learning resource center and expediting its use. (pp. 13-14).

schedules, they also include low-level clerical auditing with little time left for work on technical core issues or those issues that involve change and innovation (Peterson, 1978). Much of the principal's time and energy is devoted to discipline problems, conflict resolution, or the prevention of conflict that is latent in the system of interrelationships that characterizes contemporary school systems (Wolcott, 1973).

A persistent theme in the literature on the principalship is one of too much responsibility and too little authority. (See, for example, DeLeonibus, 1979.) The status of principals is also weakened by the formation and increased power of teacher bargaining units (Pharis and Zakariya, 1975). Authority becomes eroded when the principal is rendered powerless (as often happens) by the competing demands and authority of the central office and school board, federal and state laws and court decisions, parents, teachers backed by union contracts, and students (Thomson and DeLeonibus, 1979).

But the educational and managerial responsibilities of principals continue to grow. Increasing violence and vandalism, mandates from state and federal agencies for special services and special needs, and pressures to increase teaching effectiveness in basic skills present organizational and educational challenges of unprecedented magnitude. Given these complexities, the principals can no longer be expected to fill these roles alone (Barth, 1979). The instructional leadership role must be viewed as one of marshalling resources--human and material--that classroom teachers require to perform effectively. Projects such as Teacher Corps, that bring a variety of resources from the university, community, local school districts, and other consultants to the local school, are examples of the kinds of help principals can muster to achieve their goals. These opportunities provide a challenge, however, and not all building administrators possess sufficient awareness or skills to take advantage of them.

The Effective Principal

While there is consensus in the literature that the involvement of the principal is a key determinant of success of any new program in his/her school, it is equally apparent that a principal who is effective in facilitating change is one who is an "effective" principal in general. For

example, the growing body of research indicates that at schools where student achievement is higher than might be expected principals provide strong leadership and support. Faculties at these schools report that their principals facilitate innovation, support teachers in efforts to promote new ideas, and go out of their way to assist in acquiring needed materials (Mangers, 1978). It is therefore important to understand what characteristics researchers and educational administrators have determined to be components of "effective" leadership in schools.

Interest in effective leadership has been particularly sparked by several recent studies that assert that contrary to the prevailing belief that schooling cannot counteract the effects of home background on pupil outcomes (Coleman, 1966; Jensen, 1969), schools can and do make a difference (Edmonds, 1979; Weber, 1971; Edmunds and Frederiksen, 1978; Brookover and Lezotte, 1977). Characteristics of schools that appear to be most predictive of effectiveness in schools in low-income (i.e., "disadvantaged") areas include:

- strong administrative leadership;
- a climate of high expectations for all children;
- a focus on basic skills instruction;
- clearly understood teaching objectives; and
- use of standardized tests for performance measurement and planning.

Although all these characteristics are related to strong administrative leadership, there are certain essential features of leadership that need to be better understood. While the literature stresses the importance of administrative "leadership" and "support," it tends to be very vague in describing effective administrative behaviors. Edmonds (1979), for example, suggests that effective administrative teams provide a good balance between management and instructional skills and do "appropriate" planning and decision making. He also found that effective principals

- do not try to administer everything from the office;
- visit classrooms and respond to what they observe; and
- involve the entire professional staff in fostering a commitment to teaching all the pupils in the building.

Blumberg and Greenfield (1980) found that three factors explain "on the job success" of principals: a "vision" and expressed desire to make their schools over "in their image"; a tendency to be proactive, assertive, and quick to assume the initiative in relation to the work-world environment; and resourcefulness in being able to structure their roles and the demands on their time in a manner that permits them to pursue what might be termed their personal objectives as principals.

These researchers further asserted that effective school administrators do not allow themselves to become bogged down in "administravism" and become consumed by the organizational maintenance requirements of their job. They use a relatively small portion of their personal time and energy on such matters and/or capitalize on other personnel to meet organizational demands. This finding upholds the Gross and Herriott (1968) conclusion that Educational Professional Leadership (EPL) is positively related to teacher morale, teachers' professional performance and pupil learning.

Although there have been intuitive judgments that there are certain personality traits associated with effective leadership, research on personality traits has proven inadequate (Blumberg and Greenfield, 1980). Instead, the emphasis in the literature is on certain vaguely defined behaviors and on the importance of leaders' attitudes (Clark, 1980) and the provision of needed support for a "searching, collaborative and open organization" (Blumberg and Greenfield, 1980). "Expert leaders are 'enablers' who initiate, motivate and support school improvement through motivating and exhorting teachers to concentrate on teaching, and who are able to successfully obtain political, parental and financial support" (Clark, 1980, pp. 469).

While the literature on personality traits of effective principals has been inconclusive, several studies have dealt with the psychological impacts of the role. Levenson (1968), for example, describes the stress that many administrators experience due to the many conflicts inherent in their day-to-day activities, and the "emotional toxicity" that may result from the role. Maslach (1976) describes administrator "burn out" that often results in physical and psychological distance from the situation.

Although more needs to be learned about what effective leaders actually do, the characteristics of principals who "lead" have been summarized as follows (Blumberg and Greenfield, 1980):

- goal clarity and goal orientation--an ability to make things happen and make goals operational through a long-term strategy and day-to-day activities;
- a high degree of ontological security--a willingness to welcome new ideas and not feel threatened;
- a high tolerance for ambiguity--if not they usually spend a great deal of time in routine administrative affairs;
- an ability to test the levels of interorganizational and interpersonal systems they encounter, including a willingness to take proactive stances and not give in to the "regularities" of the system;
- sensitivity to the dynamics of power;
- an ability to approach problem situations from a highly analytical perspective; and
- a willingness to "take charge" and not be "pawns of the system."

The Role of the Principal in Change

Why is the role of the principal important in the implementation of complex change programs, and what are the historical and theoretical antecedents to this issue as a concern for Teacher Corps and other projects? In recent years, increasing attention has been given in the educational change literature to the importance of the involvement of all role partners in the implementation, continuation and diffusion of planned innovations (see, for example, Rosenblum and Louis, 1979; Berman and McLaughlin, 1978; Zaltman et al., 1973).

An underlying assumption of organizational change theory is that if those who will be affected are involved in program planning and decision making, they will be more willing to make the necessary adjustments to implement planned change (Simon, 1965; Coch and French, 1948; Gaynor, 1975). It is generally maintained that the wider participation of diverse groups will lower the probability that various needs will be overlooked, and thereby enhance implementation and overcome resistance to change (Bennis, 1966; Coughlan and Zaltman, 1972; Havelock, 1971). Similarly, Berman and McLaughlin (1975) found that local staff involvement tends to increase a "sense of ownership" of the project, and that this is an extremely effective strategy for enhancing implementation and its continuation.

The role of participation in facilitating continuation of implemented changes and further diffusion of school-based innovations is also a critical issue. A number of recent studies have indicated that individuals who are singled out for strong participation in earlier phases of an innovative project may serve as "turnkey" trainers in subsequent diffusion to other schools or colleagues (see, for example, Keys and Bartunek, 1979; Moore et al., 1977; Sieber, Louis and Metzger, 1972). These findings augment the conclusions of earlier research that indicates the importance of "opinion leaders" in the diffusion process (Katz and Lazarsfeld, 1955).

Of all the potential participants who may influence the success of an educational school improvement program, the principal has been singled out as among the most important. (See, for example, Berman and McLaughlin, 1978; Rosenblum and Louis, 1979; Mangers, 1978.) Shepard (1967) found that implementation requires a specific line of authority. Wilson (1966) also concluded that there is a need for concentrated authority as a means of exerting influence over organization members in the implementation process.

Sarason (1971) states that "any proposal for change that intends to alter the quality of life in the schools depends primarily on the principal... Any kind of system change puts him/her in the role of implementing the change in the school" (p. 111). Berman (1972) makes the case even more strongly:

> The principal is the gatekeeper of change. If you had to pick one figure in the school system who really matters in terms of whether you get change or not, it is the principal. In terms of student outcomes, the principal is really key. I am talking about principals who give active support to improvement projects. We found out that if a principal is against a project, no matter what other circumstances exist in the district, the project isn't going to make it. It is going to fall apart, or it is not going to be continued. More surprising was that if a principal is neutral, there is also a problem (as quoted in Mangers, 1978).

No other position in the educational system involves close work each day with students, teachers and parents. And no other position offers as much hope for building a vital influence in the life of a school.

Emrick et al. (1977) concludes that the role of the principal is crucial to <u>all</u> stages of the change process:

- planning and initiation--it is important that principals agree with the basic concepts, provide input into the proposal and begin communicating their support and enthusiasm;
- building a temporary system--principals' behavior in "setting the project in place" affects later successes or failures;
- development and implementation--even with the presence of other individuals and resources, principals must remain interested, and ready to problem solve; and
- ending and institutionalization--principals decide what is to remain, and provide resources to continue new practices.

In short, the role of the principal is crucial to the achievement of all of the goals of a program such as Teacher Corps.

However, there is limited enlightenment in the literature as to what, in fact, a principal does, particularly in the context of an innovative process. The works of Wolcott (1973) and Goldhammer et al. (1971) provide a good understanding of what it is like to be a principal and of the principals' perceptions of major problems that confront them in their work. The work of Gross and Herriott (1968) presents a thoughtful conceptualization of the role of executive educational leadership, one that reflects efforts to facilitate the achievement of organizational objectives through influencing staff members. This work begins to grapple with the question of the role the principal should (or could) adopt in relationship to teachers where innovation is concerned, and the types of relations between administrators and teachers that hold the greatest promise of improving teachers' performance.

While there is an implicit assumption in the literature that the principal is more often a facilitator than an initiator of organizational change, Small (1974); in a discussion of how principals initiate and respond to change, identifies a number of other role options for the principal as organizational change agent:

- Initiator. The principal makes changes according to his perception of the need . . .
- Stimulator. The principal . . . provides the opportunity for the appropriate constituencies to develop recommendations . . .

- Reactor. The principal . . . responds directly to the situation.
- Implementor. The principal is required to implement changes decided upon by central administration.
- Conduit. The principal . . . may then plan an intermediary role and seek to connect those requesting change with the appropriate party.
- Orchestrator-Mediator. The principal may seek to create the context in which change can be negotiated among the parties concerned.
- Persuader or Dissuader. He may . . . persuade those proposing changes not to push for the change they have proposed, to push for something else, or to change the timing of their efforts.
- Advocate. He may choose to support those pushing for the change and join them in attempting to bring the change about.
- Ombudsman. The principal . . . voices the concerns of of any group whose point of view might otherwise not be given adequate consideration.
- Nonactor. He may choose to make only minimal response to the change proposal and not actively pursue any of the above roles (Small, pp. 21-22).

Research and experience dictate that the principal can enhance change, but also can inhibit change, especially when a new program is not initiated by him/her. Many innovative programs are, in fact, initiated outside of the school--at the district or even more distant level in which case principals have a particularly ambiguous role. In such programs there is also potential for conflict if the project managers and the principals have competing interests. Many are also externally managed, (and Teacher Corps is a prime example of an externally managed program).

In projects that are externally initiated and managed, the principal acts as a filter through which the potential for change must pass. A programmatic intervention (i.e., the potential for change) can sometimes bypass the filter (i.e., the principal), but certain elements of the change process must come in contact with the filter. This contact can result in several potential outcomes: change can be blocked completely; filtered and reduced in impact; or magnified. The greatest potential for change, and the desired outcome, so to speak, would be the magnification process that is facilitated through principal leadership and support.

While the principal's role is important to successful implementation of a new program, it is apparent that the principal is not the sole determining factor of either the functioning of a school or any change effort within it. His/her input is pivotal, but is not the only input. There are other influences on the success of a new programmatic effort, including the nature of the institutional setting, the climate, the motivations for change, certain teacher characteristics, implementation strategies, and the degree to which other resources (including personal and material) are available to the school (Rosenblum and Louis, 1979; Berman and McLaughlin, 1978; Louis et al., 1979).

One limitation of the role of principals in change results from the "loose coupling" or "loosely linked" nature of schools (Weick, 1976; Rosenblum and Louis, 1979). Educational administration at the district level is only loosely coupled to educational administration in a school, as is school administration loosely coupled to activities in the classroom (Deal, et al., 1975; Peterson, 1976).

The degree of autonomy and discretion that principals and teachers have over their activities thus limits the amount of control administrators may have on other units within a system (be they schools or classrooms). "Schools can be seen as federations of effort rather than as closely controlled mechanisms responding to central management and engineering manipulation" (Corwin and Edelfelt, 1977, p. 30). Schools have some activities that are highly bureaucratized, and others that are not. The provision of instruction is often less role bound than more peripheral functions. Some individual administrators may be directive in some matters, and permissive in others (Lortie, 1969).

One usually thinks of what a principal can do, and attributes to him/her a good deal of power and freedom to act. However, there are also many things that he/she cannot do; there are restrictions, formal and informal, that limit his/her freedom of action (Sarason, 1971).

Some of these limits are self-imposed--particularly in schools that have many problems and needs and are hard places to change. The knowledge on the part of the principal that what he/she wants to do may and will encounter frustrating obstacles frequently serves as justification for staying near the lower limits of the scope of the principal's role (Sarason,

1971). Furthermore, the principal's actual knowledge of the characteristics of the system is frequently incomplete and faulty, and many principals function in as passive and conforming a role as the system will tolerate. Many principals lack the vision, administrative skills or human relation skills that are necessary to foster change in their schools. "School systems (and innovative projects) typically set the lower limits of the scope and responsibility of the principal. The upper limits of the role are far less determined by the system than we might think by looking at modal performance" (Sarason, 1971, p. 146).

One source of the limitation on the principal's role in change relates to the "balancing" or "mediator" role of principals:

> His job is in large part that of maintaining a working equalibrium of at best antagonistically cooperative forces. This is one reason why school administrators are rarely outspoken protaganists of a consistent and vigorously profiled point of view . . . he cannot alienate significant segments . . . and stay in business. (From Spindler, 1963, p. 142)

Principals may also resist or avoid involvement in change efforts because of the effects of such efforts (particularly federally funded programs) on the principals themselves. Such programs can affect the principals' jobs in several ways:

- imposing constraints on their role through new rules and regulations;
- subjecting them to public scrutiny;
- limiting their ability to control their own schedules;
- creating new administrative burdens, particularly paperwork;
- increasing needs to consult with parent and advisory groups; and
- creating the need to coordinate actions of specialists and teachers (From Hill et al., 1980).

The increase in the number of federal programs in schools has hit the low income schools the hardest, imposing the greatest administrative burden on people already under great stress. Respondents in a survey on the effects of federal education programs on school principals report they spend an average of ten hours per week on paperwork associated with federal

programs, and up to one day per week dealing with parents and advisory groups (Hill et al., 1980). They also report that they do not receive adequate training in federal program management or in the management of collective bargaining agreements.

How important then is it for principals to be involved, especially in programs where other individuals, both from outside and within the school are available to manage the program and facilitate the activities? McLaughlin and Marsh (1978) found that in some cases, highly effective project directors can compensate for lukewarm principals, particularly if they focus on activities like individualized instruction or curriculum revision that can occur "behind closed doors." But for more lasting institutional change to occur, the principal's role is crucial.

Given the risks and the costs of participating in or actively fostering change efforts, there must be a strong incentive for principals to do so (Pincus, 1973). The need for educational reform persists, and the unequivocality in the literature on the important role of principal involvement in change suggests that principals must be encouraged to take the risks and structures must be developed to enable principals to play a role.

The Study Context: The Teacher Corps Program

A major focus of this chapter (and the present study) is to "state the problem" regarding the role of principals in Teacher Corps projects. In order to understand that role, it is important to describe the history and purposes of the Teacher Corps program. This history is important because it helps explain the evolution of the role of principals in Teacher Corps, as well as the limitations of that role that are apparent in the projects as they are currently functioning.

The Teacher Corps Program has been one of the most enduring federally funded interventions for education improvement. Originally passed as part of the Higher Education Act of 1965, the legislation has been amended seven times, most recently in the Educational Amendments of 1976. The original legislation that authorized the Teacher Corps established two broad purposes for the program: (1) to strengthen the educational opportunities available to children in areas having concentrations of low-income families;

and (2) to encourage colleges and universities to broaden their programs of teacher education.

Over the years, the Teacher Corps has been the subject of many internal and external evaluations, including at least nine major studies (among these are RMC, 1970; Harvard, 1976; RMC, 1972; Abt Associates, 1972; Corwin, 1973; Marsh, 1975) and is currently undergoing a major evaluation by SRI. The cumulative impacts of these studies and research on related programs, of demographic changes and the efforts of advocacy groups have been many changes in the legislative and regulatory framework for the Teacher Corps Program and the way in which Teacher Corps projects operate. These shifts are most notable in the program's organizational structure, objectives, programmatic focus and scope.

At the time of the program's inception, the public educational system, especially in low-income areas, was faced with a teacher shortage. The Teacher Corps was established to attract a new cadre of dedicated teachers and to train them in an innovative field-based teacher education program. Until 1978, Teacher Corps projects were funded for two years. A typical project grantee was a college of education in cooperation with a local school district (the project director was usually on the faculty of the college). Until 1974, at the heart of each project were approximately five Teacher Corps teams consisting of an experienced teacher (team leader) and a group of four to six inexperienced trainees who spent 20% of their time in formal classwork and the remainder of their time as interns in the school and community.

The Teacher Corps Program began Phase II of its history with the passage of the education amendments in 1974. PL 93-380 (signed into law by President Ford on August 21, 1974) added a third purpose: to encourage institutions of higher education and local education agencies to improve programs of training and retraining for teachers and teacher aides. This addition reflected the dramatic demographic changes that had taken place since the original conception of the program. There was no longer a teacher shortage; declining enrollments coupled with the tendency for teachers to remain in the profession for longer time periods had in fact produced teacher surpluses in many areas.

Although pre-service teacher education (the original focus of the program) was no longer a high priority, Teacher Corps adapted to the change by shifting its focus to provide in-service teachers with new skills necessary to strengthen educational opportunities for disadvantaged students (its primary goal). The number of interns was reduced from 30 or more in each project to 4 at each local site. New in-service approaches were merged with the pre-service effort utilizing such techniques as individualized instruction, team teaching and competency-based teacher education. Teacher Corps began to focus training efforts on all teachers in participating schools, emphasizing that for change to occur in the schools, the entire school staff should be involved and support the changes being implemented.

The 1976 amendments propelled Teacher Corps into its current Phase III which focuses on long-term demonstrations of institutional development and change in both schools and institutions of higher education. Following the new amendments, four stated objectives for Teacher Corps projects were published in the Rules and Regulations (Federal Register, February 23, 1978):

1. Improved school climate which fosters the learning of children from low-income families.
2. An improved educational personnel development system for persons who serve or who are preparing to serve in schools for children of low-income families.
3. The continuation of educational improvements (including products, processes and practices) made as a result of the project after federal funding ends.
4. The adoption or adaptation of those educational improvements by other educational agencies and institutions (p. 7533).

Beginning with Program 78, Teacher Corps projects include the entire staff at one to four schools comprising a total K-12 feeder system, are funded for five years (based on annual refunding) and focus on four major activity phases to achieve the objectives listed above:

- Development or planning activities in the first year, (including the recruitment of interns);
- Operational activities, i.e., pre- and in-service training in the second and third year, including the involvement of the four interns for the two years;

- Institutionalization activities to promote the continuation of educational improvements; and
- Dissemination of program features to other schools, universities and educational agencies.

The extension of the duration of projects from two to five years with a delineation of project phases represents a recognition by the program planners that the process of institutional change is developmental and requires sufficient time and extended support. This assumption is supported by recent research (see, for example, Rosenblum and Louis, 1979; Berman and McLaughlin, 1978).

A number of key program features are prescribed in the Rules and Regulations (Federal Register, February 23, 1978) as strategies to achieve the programs's objectives and outcomes described above. These demonstrate the comprehensive nature of Teacher Corps projects as they are currently constituted. There is a focus on curriculum and instruction (specifying multicultural education and diagnostic/prescriptive teaching), staff development (specifically integrated pre- and in-service training design); and prescribed governance structures (specifically an elected Community Council and representative Policy Board). In addition, the program calls for "a collaborative mode of operation involving the associated institutions, communities and other vested interest groups" (HEW/OE RFP #79-54). In the words of a Teacher Corps staff member, "there is probably not a single important educational issue that is not the concern of a Teacher Corps project and its staff during the life of a project."

Teacher Corps has been a flexible and evolving program from its earliest years and has increasingly moved from a "top-down" to a more participatory focus. For example, during the first phase of Teacher Corps (1966-1974), a typical project moved from one that was planned mainly by college faculty members to one that was planned and administered jointly by an institution of higher education (IHE), one or several local school districts, and a local community or cluster of communities (Teacher Corps: Past or Prologue, 1975). In Phase II, it moved from the limited involvement of experienced teachers (the team leaders who worked with the interns) to total school staff involvement not only in retraining but also in planning and carrying out all phases of project activities. This total staff involvement now includes the involvement of principals as well as other school practitioners.

Although there is not a formal governance role for building principals, the current Rules and Regulations for Teacher Corps projects have a number of implications for the role and involvement of principals:

- Principals, for the first time since the inception of the Teacher Corps Program, became eligible for Teacher Corps-sponsored retraining and are now regarded as "key elements" in a Teacher Corps project.
- Representatives of principals' organizations are now eligible to be optional (although not mandated) members of the Policy Board.
- The emphasis on local determination of project objective and design reflecting local circumstances is likely to involve the role of principals.
- The emphasis on improved school climate, accountability of each project for adoption, and adaptation of educational improvements in its schools (many of which imply the implementation of new curriculum ventures and instructional methods, organizational and other changes that affect the entire school) imply the requirement of support and involvement of principals, each of whom has ultimate responsibility for instructional activities in his/her school.

A current Teacher Corps project can be described as a complex, temporary, interorganizational and interpersonal linkage system. The official organizational units in the linkage system are the IHE, the LEA and the elected Community Council. Each project includes a set of core project components: a preservice intern program that includes trainee involvement in the schools, in the community and in formal courses in the affiliated IHE; a "retraining" or staff development program that may include in-school consulting, in-service workshops, or formal graduate courses offered by the IHE; and activities of an elected Community Council.

A typical Teacher Corps project includes a specially constituted core project staff that coordinates the variety of project components and their related activities. Although each project follows its own organization and design, this staff is likely to include a Project Director, who is usually affiliated either with the IHE or LEA; an Assistant Director, who may have specific responsibilities such as project documentor, evaluator, or coordinator of in-service programs; a Team Leader who works with and coordinates the activities of the interns; a Community Coordinator who facilitates the work of the Community Council; a variety of facilitators

who may work as consultants in the schools and design and deliver in-service workshops, etc., that vary with the structure and design of each project.

Teacher Corps regulations prescribe that the Dean of the IHE, the District Superintendent, and the Community Council Chairperson serve on a Formal Policy Board. Some projects have additional structures for group planning and decision making. These may include task forces or steering committees that cut across the project schools, or they may be within school committees. In addition to project staff, the committees typically include teachers and frequently include principals. In many projects the Policy Board has been expanded to include union representatives, teachers, principals and other relevant individuals from the LEA or IHE.

Although each project is a formal "collaboration," in fact the projects vary as to where the major influence or power lies, i.e., in the IHE or LEA (or more rarely, within the project schools). This fact may sometimes be a function of which group initiated the project, or where the Project Director is located.

Projects vary as to their underlying philosophy and how they view the project staffs' roles and function. Some projects and their staff view themselves primarily as a cadre of experts who deliver training and provide new knowledge to the system. Other projects view themselves primarily as a "support system" to the project schools, particularly in the staff development and school improvement activities. While they provide resources and consultation, they may be more reactive than proactive in the design and delivery of programs. Most projects, of course, are a combination of both approaches.

The Role of Principals in Teacher Corps

In general, the current Teacher Corps program is based on certain explicit and implicit assumptions:

- school improvement is necessary;
- there are problems in schools serving low-income areas, including problems in school climate, instructional practices and curriculum;
- the problems are remedial;

- remediation is possible through improved staff development at both the preservice and inservice levels;
- resources are available, including information and skill resources at IHEs; and
- the principal is "key" to the success of the program.

The last assumption is the least explicated in the Program Guidelines, Rules and Regulations. Although a major function of the Teacher Corps linkage system is to provide resources, both human and material, for improvement and institutional change in local schools, historically, the Teacher Corps has formally overlooked the principal, or at least did not have an officially mandated role for him or her, relative to other role groups involved in the program.

This may be particularly unfortunate in light of specific thrusts of Teacher Corps to improve school climate, staff development and the diffusion of improved practices to other schools. As discussed in Part One of this paper, the literature on instructionally effective schools in low income areas and on the continuation of change demonstrates that those outcomes are highly related to effective school leadership (Edmonds, 1979; Mann, 1980; Berman and McLaughlin, 1978; Rosenblum and Louis 1979). Moreover, the successful implementation of new programs in schools and the achievement of program goals and outcomes is heavily mediated by the role and involvement of principals. But the role of the principal in Teacher Corps is an ambiguous one, and one that is complicated by many individual school, school district, project and regulatory constraints.

A major gap is evident in the literature when we look for guidance on the potential role of the principal in Teacher Corps. Most studies, even these few that deal with the principal's role in the innovative process, tend to do so within the context of the school as a closed system. Teacher Corps, on the other hand, is a collaborative effort of IHE, LEA and Community, in which decisions are made by a multi-constitutent group outside of any individual school, and many external resources are brought to bear within the school context. The role of the principal in this context is far different than one in which he/she has autonomy and major control and authority over activities and processes that occur within the school building. The principal in this context can be viewed as an internal change agent, but

one who is part of a rather complex interorganizational and interpersonal linkage system that involves both external decision makers and change agents. Thus, not only is the principal's role inherently a complex one, but the program context in which we are viewing the principal's role is complex as well. There is potential for considerable stress regarding principal autonomy in a program such as Teacher Corps which is collaboratively governed and which brings many external resources into the school. A project staff member can potentially play a complementary or a competitive role with principals. The manner in which this issue is handled can have important implications for the success of a project. The potential for principal involvement is there. The potential for avoidance is also there (both by principals themselves and by project staff members) and, in many ways, Teacher Corps projects can functionally bypass the principal's involvement.

The already substantial demands on principals' time and the daily problems faced by principals raise the question: Why burden principals further with participation in projects like the Teacher Corps? Several reasons warrant the fostering of principal involvement:

1. Principals generally want to be involved. One survey asked principals to select a description that best described their place in the school system. Of the 2,400 principals who were surveyed, 54% reported they were leaders, 41% reported they were supporters and only 5% said they were followers (NEA Research Division, 1958).

2. Principals will increase program chances for success. As Acheson (1978) points out, cooperation is required from the district level and the building level. If the building administrators are part of the program, there is more likelihood of success. If they are actively involved as trainers or co-developers, they usually function as advocates for the program rather than as obstacles.

3. Principals increase the impact of the program. Again, Acheson (1978) suggests that an intervention may impact more teachers through the involvement of principals than would be possible otherwise. Teacher Corps projects are expected to affect the entire faculty of a target school; this is difficult to establish with a small project staff. The use of school principals provides a multiplier effect and often makes it possible to reach teachers who might not otherwise become heavily involved in the activities of a project.

4. Principals themselves can benefit from involvement. A Teacher Corps project may be helpful for the principal in implementing some of his or her own plans for the school. Furthermore, the participation of different role groups in planning and executing a project will result in increased communication among the different groups. Teachers will get a better understanding of the issues that face principals and principals will learn more about the frustrations and issues that are encountered by the teaching staff.

The potential for change is clearly enhanced if principal leadership and support are present. The national Teacher Corps Program has begun to grapple with the need to better understand the role principals can and should play in local Teacher Corps projects. To this end, Abt Associates Inc. was awarded a contract to conduct and synthesize case studies of four Teacher Corps projects and the ways principals have contributed to them. A major purpose of this effort is to help administrators, trainers of administrators, project managers, and Teacher Corps policy makers develop better strategies for maximizing the effectiveness of principals in complex change projects.*

Undoubtedly, there are a number of principals who do their jobs well, and who have innate, intuitive reportoires of behaviors, strategies, or approaches that permit them to have a significant positive impact on important issues, events, and special programs. There are also a number of projects that have managed to maximize the effectiveness of principals in those projects. We can learn from both their successes and failures. The centr.l need is to unlock this "craft knowledge" and make it more explicit and thus more widely shared among professional colleagues.

---

*The Methodology used tc conduct the case studies is described in Appendix A.

A NOTE ON THE CASE STUDIES

The following section contains a synthesis of case studies of four Teacher Corps projects and the role of principals in those projects. Case studies of four representative projects were conducted for the following purposes:

- To gather data on the ways in which principals influenced or were influenced by the Teacher Corps project;
- To provide the substantive base for the Synthesis which analyzes factors affecting the role of the principal across the four projects; and
- To provide the substantive base for a Training Manual in which training needs for administrators and project staff are identified and illustrative training materials are provided.

The case studies were based on field interviews with principals and representatives of other role groups involved in Teacher Corps projects (project staff, teachers, district personnel, and community members), observations and a review of documents prepared within the local projects. Site visits were conducted by a two-person team for a total of five days--two days in December, 1979 and three days in February or March, 1980. Wherever possible, the site visit team observed project related meetings or activities in progress during the visits. Although the project specific case studies are not reprinted here, the following are brief descriptions of the four case study project sites.

(1) The Mid-Atlantic Urban Project involved a nationally known, private, traditionally black university and four schools in a regional district in a major mid-Atlantic city. Both the project director and assistant director had extensive experience in previous Teacher Corps projects and other federal programs, including a project in a high school in the same regional district in an earlier Teacher Corps cycle. The project was designed to provide support and staff development for the new major thrust of the school district: the implementation of a district-wide curriculum change. Three important features of this project were the involvement of a school-based planning team in each of the project schools, a very broad-based

which includes principals, and an active administrative workshop component which, under the leadership of a specially assigned university facilitator, provides training and support to the school administrators.

(2) The "Metropolis" project centered around two K-8 elementary schools and a college in a community district located in the inner city of a major metropolitan area. The project, initiated by the district, is co-directed by a representative from the district and one from the college. Although new to Teacher Corps, both the college and the district had previous experience with federal programs. Project activities center around a series of workshops oriented towards encouraging teachers to integrate aspects of the arts and humanities into their teaching of other disciplines. One feature of this project is the presence of a separate Teacher Corps staff person in each school who serves as a team leader of the interns and co-ordinates other project activities in the school. Another major feature is the active involvement of the two project school principals in the management of the project. Each serves on the project's steering committee and together with the two team leaders and project co-directors has a substantial share of control and management of the project.

(3) The Southern Rural Project serves three schools (two elementary and one high school) in an isolated, poor, dispersed rural county. The project was initiated through a regional resource center whose director also managed a project in an earlier cycle in the same county. The substantive focus of the project is on teacher competencies identified in a needs assessment during the planning year, particularly in the areas of multi-cultural education, career education, and education of exceptional children. The underlying theme of the project is to bring in resources to alleviate isolation, lack of motivation, and lack of self-esteem of students and teachers. A core project staff which operates out of a field office on the grounds of the project's high school coordinates project activities and delivers services to schools. They have worked hard to overcome their status as "outsiders," and to gain the trust of the principals. The project takes a responsive and accomodating attitude toward needs expressed by principals, and one of the project gains has been that principals have "learned to ask" for things. One important feature of the project has been to resond to the new high school

principal's request for help in working towards gaining high school accreditation from the Southern Association.

(4) The Large University/Small Town Project involves four schools in a small town and a large nearby university. Both the dean and superintendent viewed this project as an opportunity to strengthen the ties between the school district and the university. The initial program effort relied heavily upon formal courses offered by the university which were tailored to the emphasis of Teacher Corps and the formal needs assessment conducted by the project. Another major feature was a climate study of the high school. Although the support and input of principals was solicited by the project leadership from the beginning, there were initially few formal mechanisms for principals to exert influence on the project. However, a new major thrust of the project, a school-based consulting program has emerged in large part from the initiative of one of the school principals.

THE ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL IN TEACHER CORPS
A CASE STUDIES SYNTHESIS

Introduction

Of all the roles that a school principal must play in the day-to-day life of a school, defining and enacting a role in an externally initiated and externally managed school improvement program is often among the most ambiguous. The complex administrative and educational issues that a principal faces on a daily basis compete with any efforts at involvement in a project such as Teacher Corps, a change project that brings an infusion of staff and resources whose total commitment is to the project. The temporary system created by the project operates as if it has a life of its own with, at best, an unclear role for the principal.

This study of the role of the principal in four Teacher Corps projects reinforces the already established evidence that role overload, potential risks associated with facing change, role ambiguity, and unclear expectations of what a change project will produce will strongly influence the degree to which principals will be willing or able to play a part in an innovative school program (Kent, 1979). However, based on this study of four projects, we can make some general statements about the role a principal can and does play in such projects, and describe some factors that contribute to a principal's ability to influence and be influenced by involvement in a change project such as Teacher Corps.

It is necessary, however, that we first point out some significant characteristics of the study that limit the generalizability of the findings. The study was limited to schools that were involved in the four Teacher Corps projects in our sample. These projects were purposively (not randomly) chosen (see Appendix A describing the methodology for conducting this study) with an attempt to represent the diversity of Teacher Corps, but with a particular attempt to select projects that would illuminate different aspects of principal involvement, both successes and failures. Two of the projects are located in large urban inner city neighborhoods; one in a more isolated small town, another in a rural area. Two of the projects are managed by staff who had previous experience with Teacher Corps; two are not, although one of the latter had previous experience with innovative programs in the

local schools. The range of experience of the thirteen principals involved in the study is from one to twenty-five years as a full principal. Only one of the thirteen principals is a female, although several of the assistant principals in the schools (who also played a role in the projects) are female.

Because Teacher Corps regulations require that participating schools have certain characteristics, specifically a student body that is predominantly low-income, our sample is not representative of all schools and their principals may not be typical of all principals. For instance, we found only a few examples of what is referred to as a "modern administrator" (one who has studied organization theory and other management techniques). While this may be an artifact of the sample, it might also be so because low-income schools require different types of leadership, or at least people think they need different leadership styles, or because the more "modern administrators" tend to be attracted to more affluent schools.

Furthermore, at the time of our study all four projects were only midway through the second year of a five-year project cycle. In all sites, the project was in a state of flux since this was only the first full year of project implementation. The findings of this report cover only what we saw during the time of our visits. In many of the sites, we saw indications that substantial changes in project organization, substantive direction and distribution of decision-making authority were taking place. It is still much too early to predict the ultimate successes or failures of the projects' strategies and outcomes, and the degree to which principals affect them. Our comments cover only the early portion of the projects' lifespans, and the patterns we saw emerging then.

As discussed in the preceding chapter, it is generally accepted that principals are the "key" to the introduction of change into the school and are critical influences on the effect of Teacher Corps on school climate, pupil outcomes and staff development. However, until fairly recently (1976) the role of the building principal was not mentioned in the legislation. Even after the amendments to the legislation were introduced to enhance the potential for principal involvement, there were no clear guidelines to define the type or amount of principal influence that was appropriate or necessary. Consequently, the degree to which principals became involved in the projects

or assumed leadership within them was left to the discretion of the project staff and the principals themselves.

In many ways, the role that principals play in the projects is a negotiated process, and depends on the roles assigned to them in the project design and by project staff (often without clearly thought-out or clearly stated expectations), and depends also on the roles that principals themselves initiate. As a result, there is considerable diversity in the extent to which principals are involved in the four projects in the study.

All project staffs had made a deliberate effort to involve the principal. This involvement was generally initiated in the proposal writing stage when a indication of cooperation was required from the principals in the proposed schools. After initial "opening of the school door" to the project, the extent of principal involvement varied substantially <u>across</u> projects as well as across schools <u>within</u> a given project.

It is important to point out that even in schools where the Teacher Corps project was comparatively very active, the project itself played a very small part in the ongoing activities of the school. Even the most active were only involved to a limited degree--the amount of time that the principals said they spent on project-related activities ranged from an average of 5 minutes to 3 hours a week. This is not to suggest that time spent on the project is correlated with commitment and support--in each of the projects there were at least some principals who were extremely committed to and supportive of the project. But in every school we visited, project-related activities were sandwiched in between the more pressing management and disciplinary responsibilities of the principals.

In the following sections, we will discuss the types of activities principals can and do engage in in the Teacher Corps projects, and the significance of the principal's role in projects. We will identify some of the factors that influence the extent of principal participation; these factors are grouped into the following categories: external characteristics and project characteristics that affect cross-project variation; and principal and school characteristics that affect within-project variation. We will also discuss some important issues identified during our study and present some recommendations for policy makers, project managers and principals themselves.

The Role Principals Played in the Projects

In every project, at least some principals played an influential role in the evolution of the Teacher Corps Project; the extent of principal involvement made a difference in how the project was run and the kinds of activities that were sponsored. This included active involvement in the governance of the project as well as in activities in the school (as in the "Metropolis" project), participation in advising the project and in activities specifically designed for principals (as in the Mid-Atlantic urban project), facilitating entry into the schools and encouraging staff participation (as in the southern rural project), and assuming a leadership role to create a new project emphasis in a project that had until then had a minimal presence in all but one of the project schools (small town).

The case studies bear out the findings of other studies (see for example, Mann, 1980) that show the principal's role to be important to the desired outcomes of Teacher Corps projects. Quite apart from their participation in the projects, the principals' leadership and style were found to strongly affect the climate, tone, objectives and standard of the school (both positively and negatively). Each project had clear examples of this as well as evidence that teachers and other staff members looked to the principal for behavioral guidelines. Schools were the focal point for Teacher Corps projects--both as centers for in-service training to improve staff competencies, school climate and pupil achievement, and as field locations for pre-service experience. The schools were the places where change was to take place and where staff from the Institutes of Higher Education (IHEs) were to gain a better understanding of how to prepare teachers to work there. And the principal was the person most familiar with the needs of the school and its potential for change.

Principal involvement varied, however, from active ownership of the project to ceremonial support (or neutrality). At a minimum, principals aided in the timing and logistics of project-related activities in the school by setting schedules, allocating space (for Teacher Corps resource rooms or meetings), announcing events, and encouraging participation. When choices had to be made, principals or their delegated assistants usually made decisions about who in the school would participate, and had considerable influence over the choice of in-school staff to serve as project leaders and planners.

These choices are particularly important, for if the principal chooses strong and influential leaders, the project will more likely be successful than if he/she chooses staff who are largely without influence among the other teachers or staff. Furthermore the principal can subtly indicate that he/she will reward participation in the project and thereby encourage greater participation.

Even in schools where unions or other political groups constrain the amount of control that a principal has over the use of teachers' time, the principal can influence the timing of activities at the school so that they are convenient and attractive for most of the staff. For example, in one project, inservice training held during lunch hours was extended to additional time periods, or held at staff meetings to attract or serve a greater number of teachers.

We also learned that the principal's role can extend beyond that of coordinator of routine administrative tasks to one in which he/she can exert direct influence over the planning and development of the project or of particular elements within it. Since the principal has the best overview of the problems and needs of the school, he/she is in an ideal position to help shape the project so that it is responsive to those needs. For example, if the principal is receptive to assistance from project facilitators and consultants to work on special problems in the school, the exchange can be meaningful to both the principal and the project staff or the persons who are attempting to gain a better understanding of some of the day-to-day issues within the school. A principal who is in touch with his/her staff and teachers will also be sensitive to how well project activities are received, the type of impact being made, and how to increase the potential success of the activities in the school. Similarly, the principal can play an important part in the training of the interns by cooperating with the project staff in identifying teachers who will serve as good models for the interns, and encouraging those teachers to cooperate. Although we found little evidence of it happening thus far, it is also apparent that if the principal takes an active interest in the interns, and personally spends time meeting with them and answering their questions about the school, learning experience of the interns is again increased.

Evidence from the case studies suggests that the principal not only gives general approval and access to the project and allows the project staff to work within the school, but that he/she also must take an active role in the project to ensure its success within the school. Unlike other groups who participate in Teacher Corps projects, the significance of the principal's involvement is crucial throughout the life of the project. In the planning stage, the principal can influence the overall plan for the project so that it meets the needs of the school and is designed in a way that minimizes competition from other activities and demands on school staff. During the implementation years of the project, the principal can greatly facilitate the entrance of the project into the school and the extent of staff support for it. From his or her unique vantage point, the principal is able to see how the project relates to the school as a whole and can suggest modifications or additions that research indicates will more likely lead to successful institutionalization of the project in the system. At that stage, the principal will be an important lobbying force in the district for the funding necessary to continue the activities after the project money runs out. (See, for example, Emrick et al., 1977; Rosenblum and Louis, 1979; Berman and McLaughlin, 1978.)

Each project showed some evidence of one or more principals directly influencing the project to some degree, but given the importance of the principal's role to the project, it was surprising to see the variation in the extent of this involvement across sites. One explanation for this variance is that many principals appear to either lack the awareness of the influence they can exert, the assertiveness to do so, or the skills to exercise the needed leadership. Another explanation is the lack of clear guidelines or expectations from Teacher Corps that indicate how the principal should be involved. Because of the lack of these guidelines, project staff and principals are often confused about the role of the principal and hesitate to expand his/her role in the project. There are other factors that can affect the extent of the principal's involvement in the project. Some of these factors are a function of the project design, history, or management style, but others are beyond the scope of the project staff to control or change. As in other school improvement programs, external project factors

generally account for differences within projects (Louis et al., 1979; Rosenblum and Louis, 1979). Examples of these external influences are the existence of crises or other activities that compete for principal and teacher time or the general receptivity of the staff to change. On the other hand, the project staff can control several key variables that do determine to some significant extent the degree of principal participation, including the use of strategically introduced incentives to increase principal involvement. In the following sections, we will discuss the factors that appear to affect the role or participation of the principals in Teacher Corps projects--beginning with factors that affect involvement in the different projects in the study.

Factors Affecting Differences in Principals' Role Across Projects

Although there were some basic similarities of principal involvement in all projects, there were also significant differences across the projects in the degree to which principals influenced the course of the entire project and the degree to which they mustered project resources to achieve their personal objectives for their schools. A number of factors appear to influence these cross-project differences. Some of these relate to the social, cultural and political contexts in which the projects are embedded; others relate to the design, management, history and context of the project itself.

The Social, Cultural and Political Context

The legislative mandate of Teacher Corps requires that projects serve schools in low-income areas, but there are many differences in the social, cultural, and political contexts of those areas. For example, we found that projects operate very differently in large urban areas that have a history of educational change interventions than in more isolated small town or rural areas. The general level of sophistication of both the teaching and administrative staffs at the time of project initiation determines certain boundaries for the types of activities that can occur in the school. Some schools and their staffs appear more accustomed to the presence of a variety of personnel and activities in their schools. As a result they are more sophisticated in dealing with the demands and requirements of a project, and more demanding of

a right to exert an influence on what will happen. This previous experience, however, also makes them more skeptical in their expectations of what they may gain from participation in such projects. In addition, prior experience with similar projects (whether district or federally supported) is helpful because it reduces the confusion about realistic expectations and facilitates the formation of task forces and the delegation of responsibility. In at least one project, principals assigned already existing committees to form the basis for special teams in the Teacher Corps project.

The authority system of the local culture also varies and affects the role a principal plays. In some districts, such as the southern rural district in this study, school personnel have less of a tradition of active participation in decisions that will affect their schools. They are accustomed to decisions being made for them and services being delivered to them; at best their participation is only ceremonial. In communities where the school policy is often affected by union contracts and other political agreements, there are limits on the types of activities that can occur, as well as on the timing of activities and policies regarding who attends. Such constraints can strongly affect the degree to which either a principal or the project staff can control the participation of school staff and in many ways requires more creative approaches to encourage staff development.

Project Structures for the Distribution of Decision Making Authority

Many features of the project design influence the role of the principal in the project. Among the most significant are the mechanisms that have been created to formally distribute decision-making authority in the project. Evidence from the case studies substantiates the notion that the involvement of several different role groups (including administrators) in project decisions increases the likelihood that these role groups will be actively involved in fostering project outcomes, and that their needs will be met. In three of the four projects, all principals were either members of the Policy Board or of the active Steering Committee of the project. In at least one case, the principal exerted strong influence on decisions that affect the project.

However, shared decision-making authority is not without risks. It makes the decision-making process more time-consuming and difficult. It can also result in competition for leadership and in potential conflict between project staff and principals, as was evidenced at one site.

The involvement of different groups who compete for project benefits is especially interesting in Teacher Corps because the parties to the decision, such as schools, LEA, IHE, community, and project staff, each have their own viewpoint and agenda. Some projects have managed to minimize the competition among groups by concentrating decision making within the project staff or within the initiating organization. While such a procedure minimizes the potential for conflict, it does not foster the collaborative interchange that research suggests must develop during the project to maximize outcomes and ensure project continuation later on. The type as well as the number of decisions for which principals share responsibility also makes a difference. However, the importance of the administrative and logistical decisions made by most principals should not be minimized. Indeed, the administrative decisions substantially influence who attends the sessions and what the subsequent impact will be. While almost all principals in the study were involved in some administrative decisions, the more active ones also tended to be involved in decisions that related overall policy.

Project Structures to Provide Training and Support to Principals

All projects attempted to gain the support of principals for project activities and in most cases to obtain their advice and requests. However, despite the fact that Teacher Corps is now in the business of promoting school-wide change, there appears to be insufficient awareness on the part of project designers of the crucial role of in-school administrative leadership in achieving the desired school-wide outcomes. Not all principals possess the leadership skills required for an "instructionally effective school" (Edmonds, 1979) in low-income areas, and in fact, principals may need support and/or training to strengthen their skills in order to meet the desired Teacher Corps school outcomes. Although principals may gain some important benefits and skills through participation in project decision-making structures or through Teacher Corps-sponsored regional and national activities, only

one project in this study actually designed a project component that provided training and support directly to principals. These workshops have the potential for not only personally benefitting individual principals, but for promoting improvements within their schools as well.

The Project Staff's View of Their Role

Strongly associated with the social and cultural context, and with the decision-making structures described above, is the project staff's view of their role in the projects. There are many differences among the four projects in the ways project staff perceived and/or carried out their functions. Some viewed themselves as running the project for the schools; others have a primary loyalty to the University, but acceded to the local norms of working at least ceremonially through the principals. In these cases, the degree to which the principals took on a more active role depended on the initiative of the principals themselves (as, for example, one of the elementary principals in Small Town). In one project (Metropolis), one of the co-directors was struggling with the acknowledged need to share control so that continuation of project outcomes would be ensured. In only one project did the project's leader consciously view themselves primarily as a "support system" to the project. They stated that the "project is the project schools." Though the idea is sophisticated in concept, it takes great skill on the part of project staff and school staff to facilitate the local ownership and management that they desire.

The History of the Project: Previous Relationship Between IHE and LEA

The role of history as a determinant of the relationship that is established by any new project is an important one (Sarason, 1971). In this case, Teacher Corps represents an attempt to establish a new setting, or a temporary system that acts as a change agent, and this new setting is established within a context that can strongly influence its operation and effectiveness. One aspect of history that is particularly important to the Teacher Corps project is the previous relationship between the LEA and the IHE.

The extent to which the relationship between the IHE and LEA had existed prior to the introduction of the Teacher Corps project can increase

the potential that a profitable exchange will result for both organizations. In schools where university-based consultants had previously been involved in the schools, the potential for involvement was increased by their familiarity with the local educational system and with the administrators and staff. Similarly, administrators who had worked with external consultants could more effectively draw on them for additional help.

Source of Project Initiation

Another important historical factor in the life of a project is the source of project initiation. The initiator, or force, behind the original proposal for the project has significant impact on the overall design and on the kind of activities that are planned. Projects can be initiated by the LEA, by the IHE, by an organization that is external to both organizations, or by a group that consists of representatives from both organizations. Although in most sites major changes were made after the original proposal was funded, control of the project in its early stages made a difference later in allocation of resources, type of staff hired, distribution of authority and, eventually, project impacts. In general, projects that were initiated by the LEA (as in Metropolis), or in which the LEA was a strong collaborator (as in the Mid-Atlantic urban project), tended to have a better understanding of the political situation in the schools, as well as a way to determine what was needed by the schools and how to more effectively meet the principals' needs than those projects initiated at the IHE. The latter projects did not have as clear an idea of what principals or schools wanted from such a program. If IHE staff feel their agenda is more important than the agenda of the schools, one-way rather than two-way communication will prevail and the collaborative effect will be diminished. Participants from both organizations must perceive a mutual benefit from collaboration for the project to be a success.

Experience of Project Staff in Managing Similar Projects

Teacher Corps projects are particularly complex because they involve individuals from several groups (i.e., teachers and administrators from both the university and schools as well as representatives from the community).

Staffs of the projects often must utilize human relations skills as well as expertise from their substantive areas in order to facilitate project activities and encourage collaboration on the part of principals. Because much of the success of the project is attained by "selling" its significance and potential contribution to the various constituencies, the importance of this skill cannot be underestimated. However, because some project staffs lacked experience in such efforts the actual project impact was sometimes hampered. For example, one project was managed by an experienced group of people who were quite effective during the planning year in developing the project; however, after the initial year this group passed most of its responsibilities on to a less experienced group of facilitators who were not always as effective in generating cooperation and commitment from the other participants.

Initial Expectations for the Project

Early in the planning stages it is important to create expectations for project outcomes that are realistic and attractive to participants. If the project director naively promises major changes in a school system that has successfully resisted change, chances are that the staffs and principals will perceive the project as a waste of time and will not bother to get involved. If the school or district has had an unsuccessful experience with a similar project, the Teacher Corps project team must make sure that an association with this earlier project is not made and must point out the differences that will make the Teacher Corps project a likely success.

Factors Affecting Differences in the Role of the Principals Within Projects

Just as the project's design, management and history, and the context in which it is embedded have features that facilitate or inhibit principal involvement in a project such as Teacher Corps, individual principals also have characteristics that affect their role in the project. Principal and local school characteristics account for the greatest differences in the ways principals within the same site participate in the project. Some of these characteristics are:

Complexity of the Local School

The complexity of the local school, including its size, grade level and the presence of an administrative team and specialists, is strongly related to the way in which an innovative program will operate in a school, and to the role a principal will play both in the ongoing school activities and in the project (Hage and Aiken, 1970; Rosenblum and Louis, 1979). There are differences in the authority structure, the distinctiveness of occupational roles and the division of responsibilities between an elementary school and a secondary school. The literature on the principalship suggests that building principals in elementary schools tend to play a much more active role in curriculum planning and supervision, while secondary school principals tend to emphasize overall administration of the school, liaison with the district and community, and coordination of subunits, an administrative team and department heads. Although the data from the case studies confirm this to a large extent, they also suggest that skillful secondary school administrators can play much more of an educational leadership role than is often presumed.

The extent to which a principal (regardless of school level) has assistants or other staff to whom he/she can delegate tasks is extremely important in determining the time a principal has available for non-routine planning and for participation in projects such as Teacher Corps. In general, however, principals can also delegate Teacher Corps responsibilities to an assistant or head teacher for implementation. However, if the principal delegates responsibility for Teacher Corps to a less respected assistant and does not follow through on the project's progress, then the project will falter due to lack of leadership within the school. In the sites we visited, as long as the principal was actively involved and interested in getting feedback from the assistant, the project did not suffer from indirect principal involvement--all of the staff were aware that the principal was committed to the project and to follow up on their participation in it.

The Local School Conditions

Given the complexity of the principal's job, one of the most important factors is the extent to which other projects, activities or crises compete for the administrator's immediate attention. For example, in a school where bomb threats, serious discipline problems and outbreaks of violence are

regular occurrences, it is difficult for the principal to find time and energy to devote to what may appear to be less immediate demands, such as Teacher Corps.

The inherent irony in this factor is that these issues that are related to school climate are the very issues that Teacher Corps projects are attempting to improve. The match, however, between apparent need in the school and awareness on the part of both principals and project staff that Teacher Corps can alleviate some of these crucial school problems has not always been made. For the most part, the principals who seem to successfully cope with daily school problems and foster a positive school climate are the ones who also find the time to play an active role in Teacher Corps, influence its activities and muster its resources.

Receptivity to Change

Some principals seem reluctant to take on the risks associated with introducing innovative programs into their schools: these principals may be especially reluctant to expose themselves to public scrutiny, and they avoid contact with the project by failing to attend meetings or participate in school-based activities.

Principals may not acknowledge this resistance to change even to themselves. They may be even more reluctant to acknowledge this resistance to change to project directors who attempt to understand their lack of enthusiasm even though they readily agreed to include the school in the proposal. Said one project director, "At first the principal seemed very cooperative and open to allowing us to introduce the project into his school. But he just didn't want to say no to me when I first asked him, so he seemed to go along. It was only much later that I realized that he was subtly telling me, 'no, stay out' when I tried to begin the activities there."

For some principals, participation in the Teacher Corps project may have been just what they needed to help meet their own needs or some district-wide objectives. But for other principals, as reported by Hill et al. (1980), involvement in such a project seemed to have a potential for "rocking the boat." Certain mandatory characteristics of the project such as the Community Council, appeared to increase the significance of the project to the principal. Some of the principals were pleased by the development of a community component of the project while others were threatened by it.

Leadership of the Principals

The principals' leadership style, and the general way in which they performed their role appears to have strongly influenced the ways in which they participated in the Teacher Corps project. In general, principals tend to play similar roles in Teacher Corps as they do in their regular programs: if a principal is usually involved in all aspects of the school, it is likely that he or she will be involved in all aspects of the Teacher Corps program in the school; if a principal focuses on administrative issues, then he or she will continue to focus on these areas. Some principals are more proactive than reactive in their general management of the school. These principals also tend to behave similarly in the context of the project, and frequently take the initiative to promote project features in their schools. In each project there was at least one "star" of this type. However some of the reactive principals, those who were responders rather than initiators, became very supportive of the efforts of the project staff and fostered implementation in their schools.

The type of management style does not appear to be as significant as the success that the principal has had with the style or the appropriateness of the style to the setting. Projects such as Teacher Corps can present a problem for the principal who is already overburdened by the tasks he/she must accomplish. And unless the principal has mastered the art of control, and has learned how to cope with the complexities of the job, the principal's role will likely be one of continuous fire-fighting rather than effective leadership.

As noted above, effectiveness of style is also related to school level. Many large urban high schools may require strong leaders who can "take charge" and successfully deal with the coordination, scheduling and disciplinary issues that they face in managing the school. In general if the principal's style has been effective in his/her school as measured by respect of staff and educational accomplishments of the students, then that same style will be useful in introducing the program into the school.

Sense of Vision

Also important, particularly for long-term projects such as Teacher Corps, is the principal's ability to have a "sense of vision" for the school, and to look beyond the present to the future when thinking about the project

(see Olivero, 1980). Innovative programs like Teacher Corps are bound to get bogged down at times by details and the success of these projects requires an ability to look ahead to the ultimate result rather than get frustrated by minor setbacks. Principals must be able to fit the project into their long-range plans for the school if the project is to be successfully incorporated into the day-to-day activities of the school. We found examples of principals who applied a sense of vision to the project, such as the high school principal in the Southern Rural project who used project resources to help gain accreditation for the school. In general, however, we found that many principals either lacked this sense of vision, or it was pre-empted by the day-to-day problems they faced when carrying out their tasks.

Assertiveness

Given the nature of the Teacher Corps project's organization that includes a collection of individuals from various constituencies, who each has his own expectations for the project, it is important that the principal be able to communicate his/her needs and expectations to the project staff. The overall mandate of the Teacher Corps program is very broad and unless the principals are assertive in defining their specific requirements, the final design may not develop in a way that meets the needs of the schools. Even if the principal is not assertive enough to initiate proposals, he or she must be committed enough to the project to take the time and energy necessary to critique options being considered in terms of how relevant they are for his/her school. Principal assertiveness is particularly important in projects where project staff members maintain a low profile and take little initiative to generate ideas to meet the needs of the school. In a project where such a leadership void exists, another source of initiative is required for the project to get under way. In such projects the principals are in an excellent position to take the lead and develop activities designed to benefit their schools.

Incentives to Increase Principal Involvement

One of the most important things that project directors can do to increase the potential for principal involvement is to build incentives for

principals into the project design. As already mentioned, Teacher Corps competes with many other activities for the principal's time and energy. Although a project has the potential for enhancing educational programs within a school and thereby can help the principal do a good job, project staff must first develop the principal's interest in the program. In addition, it is important that the project staff try to extend the principal's involvement beyond mere legitimization or "school door opening" to a strong commitment to and active association with the project.

We have found that principals respond to a variety of incentives. Although particular incentives may not be appropriate for all principals, due to differences in principals' skills, attitudes, or the local political interest, the following kinds of opportunities created by Teacher Corps have resulted in increased principal involvement:

(1) By developing the Teacher Corps project so that it coincides with some of the activities the principal had already been planning to implement or expand within the school, the project can reinforce the principal's own goals for the school. And by helping to meet the principal's own objectives, the potential for interesting the principal in the project and achieving change within the school is greatly increased. We do not suggest that the project adopt already existent plans and programs within the school; rather we recognize that the project's mandate is to be responsive to local needs as they relate to the more general goals of Teacher Corps. When planning and implementing the project, Teacher Corps staff should attempt to include activities that reinforce program goals, even if these activities had already been developed and planned by the principals before Teacher Corps funding.

(2) Although the principal is generally well known in the school, he or she may have little opportunity to expand these contacts beyond the immediate associates of the school. Participating in the project, however, increases principals' opportunities to meet and associate with individuals from other schools and local communities. Very often the opportunity to have shared responsibilities with individuals such as the superintendent or dean increases the attractiveness of the project to the principals. Through

participation in Teacher Corps meetings and activities, the principal's visibility in the community is increased. This potential for increased visibility may serve some important personal objectives such as solidifying the principal's political position. In three of the four projects we visited, these activities facilitated principal involvement and support for the project.

(3) One project offered administrator in-service training in addition to services for teachers. By offering an activity that is specifically designed for administrators, principals can easily recognize a benefit they can personally obtain from the project. If, as in the above project, the administrator program is well done and useful, the principal's reservations about the rest of the Teacher Corps project will be greatly diminished. In most cases, the benefits from participation in such programs are personal. However, by increasing the individual satisfaction and skills of principals, there may be ultimate institutional gains as well.

(4) As a collaborative effort, the Teacher Corps project has the potential for distributing power and influence across the different role groups. For some principals, this increased influence, whether real or imagined, is an important motivator. However, participation in the project is not without risk for principals. For instance, the project may fail for a variety of reasons, and if the principal is associated with the project he/she will also be associated with the failure. Similarly, increased visibility may make a principal's weaknesses even more apparent to others. The following statement, made by one principal about a fellow principal, illustrates this point: "I've always had the greatest respect for . . . even though we hadn't worked together; but after one year of association with him on this project, I'm afraid to admit that my respect for his capabilities and common sense sure has diminished." By confining his/her activities to his/her school, a principal can become fairly well insulated from outside review or criticism. And by expanding into the larger community of the Teacher Corps project, the principal becomes vulnerable to comparison with other principals and to assessment by a more critical audience.

Involvement with a project can make the principal more vulnerable within a school as well. If the project does not have the support of a major

political group within the school, the principal can jeopardize his/her authority by any attempts to push the program. At one of the projects we visited, attendance at the in-service sessions was mandatory for all teachers; however, the special education teachers, who were part of a district-wide political group, refused to attend the sessions, claiming that their students would not be receiving adequate supervision while the teachers were gone. Because of the political clout of the special education group, the principal was forced to make an exception to the mandatory attendance rule. When the "regular" teachers saw that the special education teachers were not required to attend, however, they began to resist attending as well.

General Reflections

Given the nature of the project's design, with representatives of many, often competing, constituencies (LEA, IHE and the Community), we saw very few instances of real collaboration. In general, project staff members make the decisions for the project which are then reviewed by the Policy Board, or by the Steering Committee. Recommendations from the project staff are infrequently overruled or altered by the various committees. There are several possible explanations for this:

(1) The groups involved are simply not interested enough to invest the energy required to compete for aspects of the project. In some districts, Teacher Corps was one of many such programs in operation, and was seen as just one more way to get needs met.

(2) The groups involved are not aware of the potential benefits that they could derive from the project. Indeed, it is quite possible that participants in the project are not familiar with its scale; for example, other than the project's staff, few people are fully aware of the total funds associated with the project.

(3) Participants are able to get their needs met by the project and do not feel any incentive for collaboration. In the one project where we saw the beginning of a collaborative effort, the reason behind the collaboration was a competition for decision-making authority over the allocation of funds. Once the participants were aware of the level of funding, the possibility of different ways for the funds to be distributed, and their role in influencing this distribution, they became more active in demanding a voice in project management.

Many principals were surpisingly unaware of the extent of influence they could have over the project, or of the degree to which they could use a project to meet their own objectives. In school districts where projects such as Teacher Corps are quite common, principals have become fairly sophisticated in influencing or utilizing such projects. However, in sites where such projects are less common and where principals have had less experience with them, principals need training to develop assertiveness and to develop an ability to negotiate with project staffs so they can get what they want for their schools. As we have discussed above principal involvement in all aspects of the project is crucial if project design is to match the needs and concerns of the school. However, unless the principals are willing and able to verbalize their needs, project staff will be largely unable to anticipate or meet these needs. In many schools in our study, principals had no idea that they could make specific requests of the project for training programs or other activities related to the project. In one school, where the principal had made a request that was granted, the principal was astonished that his request was actually met. Moreover, principals in these schools often had no idea of the kind of resources available to them, and even if they were aware that they could ask for assistance, they were uncertain about how to phrase their request.

According to many principals, one of the most important benefits to be derived from participation in the project is the opportunity to meet with other principals and discuss common problems and frustrations. This peer exchange is not generally developed at the LEA level; although the central offices do have regular principal meetings, these are usually for dissemination of information about district policy and not for exchange of ideas. In our conversations with principals we often heard that the principalship is a very lonely job, one with little feedback on performance and few opportunities to share experiences with colleagues. The ability to talk with other principals who may be experiencing similar types of frustrations and concerns is one aspect of Teacher Corps that appeals to all principals. In the one site where in-service training was specifically designed for administrators, the principals felt that this was one of the most successful activities sponsored by the project. Even though the principals were not at first eager to leave

their schools for such training sessions, they later all agreed that the benefits derived from gaining perspective on how to manage their schools, and gaining a sense of well-being and support from sharing experiences with colleagues far outweighted their initial reluctance.

It is not surprising that the most effective schools--the ones in which were was a reasonably positive school climate, good staff and pupil morale, and instructionally effective programs--were characterized by strong and assertive proactive principals. There is substantial evidence from the project schools that the very outcomes Teacher Corps is trying to achieve appear to go hand in hand with effective principals. However, an interesting fact is that Teacher Corps projects seem to function best in schools where they are needed least. In schools that are overrun by poor management, disciplinary problems, poor morale, and poor achievement Teacher Corps is less effective because a myriad of problems seems to dominate the time and energy of those who would be needed to make the project function effectively within the school. In comparison, in schools where Teacher Corps is more effective, principals have time for planning and participating in such projects, and this reinforces the effectiveness of the school. It is an unfortunate irony then that schools in desperate need of the kinds of help that Teacher Corps can provide are the ones where the principals often cannot muster the resources necessary to take advantage of the help.

Implications

There are many implications of these findings for Teacher Corps project managers and policymakers and for others interested in school improvement programs. If achievement of the Teacher Corps outcomes are as dependent on effective leadership in the schools as the case studies seem to imply, a necessary prerequisite for change may be to diagnose the schools' structure and situational leadership and to design mechanisms to enhance or develop principals' skills and make them more effective leaders in their schools. "Readiness" has been found to be a necessary precursor for change. One factor of readiness is effective administrative leadership (Herriott and Rosenblum, 1976). We do not mean that schools that are not "ready" should not be selected for participation in projects such as Teacher Corps. This

would be counter to the underlying goal of equity that is inherent in programs such Teacher Corps. What we do mean, however, is that the conditions of "readiness," which in some cases includes the provision of support and assistance necessary to strengthen leadership in the school, needs to be promoted. Can Teacher Corps achieve its goals otherwise? The answer is--only to a limited degree. While there may be individual gains--improved skills or outcomes for particular teachers or classrooms--the organizational outcomes of improved school climate, institutionalized staff development, school or district-wide adaptation and dissemination, etc., are not likely to occur.

Principals can improve their skills and effectiveness through projects such as Teacher Corps in several ways: by involvement in project structures that have been established for their participation they can gain information that will help them in their role, exposure to new ideas, experience in decision making and resource allocation, and experience in exercising leadership. They will gain even more if projects are designed to provide resources, consultation or workshops for principals themselves.

It is important to note that even effective principals need to be encouraged to view external resources as useful ways to meet needs in their schools. We do not mean to imply that principals are "deficient," but rather that the current abundance of school needs, and the limitations in resources available to meet them, suggests that the wave of the future may be increased networking and collaboration (with external organizations and resources) to achieve educational goals. Teacher Corps is but one example of opportunities that schools can take to acquire needed resources, but to succeed networking requires collaborative skills on the part of all parties in the network.

Our analysis has indicated that principals can make an important contribution to a Teacher Corps project, and that their contribution is one that is unique to the principalship and cannot be as effectively contributed by another role group. In order to generate increased involvement, project directors need to be sensitive to the significance of the principal in the project and need to build incentives into the project's design that will maximize the principal's contribution. There can be no single recommendation about the kind of incentives that are most appropriate--each project staff must make its own decision based on site characteristics.

We have noted a lack of clarity in the Teacher Corps regulations that deal with the principal's role in the project. The Teacher Corps program has changed significantly over time and has increased its scope of desired outcomes at the school organizational level, and the strategies to achieve these outcomes. Not surprisingly for a changing program such as Teacher Corps, there has been a gap between considering all the ramifications of those changes and considering the factors that need to be considered if the goals are to be attained. What is apparent is that specific mandates are needed from the Teacher Corps headquarters to systematically alert project directors to the need for principal involvement and to establish project structures that will incorporate this involvement. This may also require a change in the program's rules and regulations that builds in a more formal r.le for principals, and that more clearly establishes expectations for both principals and project staff in the collaborative arrangement.

REFERENCES

Acheson, K. "Supervisory and Administrative Personnel as Intermediaries." Paper presented at Annual Meeting, American Educational Resarch Association, Toronto, Ontario, March 19, 1978.

Barth, R. Run School Run: Inside Looking In at American Elementary Education. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, forthcoming.

Bennis, W.G. Changing Organizations: Essays on the Development and Evolution of Human Organization. New York: McGraw Hill, 1966.

Berman, P. "Testimony Before the (California) Assembly Education Committee," November 15, 1976, as quoted in Mangers, D. The School Principal: Recommendations for Effective Leadership. Sacramento, CA: Task Force for the Improvement of Pre- and In-service Training for Public School Administrators, 1978.

Berman, P. & McLaughlin, M.W. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. I. Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation, April, 1975.

Berman P. & McLaughlin, M.W. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. VIII: Implementing and Sustaining Innovations. Sants Monica, CA: Rand Corporation, 1978.

Blumberg, A. & Greenfield, W. The Effective Principal, Perspectives in School Leadership. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1980.

Brickell, H.M. Organizing New York State for Educational Change: A Study of the Dynamics of Instructional Change in the Elementary and Secondary School of New York State with Recommendations for Improved Organization. Albany, NY: New York State University, 1961.

Brookover, W.B. & Lezotte, L.W. Changes in School Characteristics Coincident with Changes in Student Achievement. East Lansing: Michigan State University, College of Urban Development, 1977.

Clark, D., & Guba, E. "An Examination of Potential Change Roles in Education." In O. Sand, Rational Planning in Curriculum and Instruction. Washington, D.C.: NEAS-CSI.

Clark, D., Lotto, L., & McCarthy, M. "Factors Associated with Success in Urban Elementary Schools" Phi Delta Kappa. March, 1980 pp. 467-470.

Coch, L. & French J. "Overcoming Resistance to Change." In Human Relations, 49, 1948, 512-532.

Coleman, J. S.. Equality of Educational Opportunity. (Summary report). Washington: U.S. Office of Education, 1966.

Corwin, R., & Edelfelt, R. Perspectives on Organizations. American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education & Association of Teacher Educators Washington, D.C.: 1977.

Coughlan, R. & Zaltman, G. "Implementing the Change Agent Team Concept." Paper presented at American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, 1972.

Deal T., Meyer, J., & Scott, W. "organizational Influences on Educational Innovations," In J. Baldrige and T. Deal (eds.), Managing Change in Educational Organizations. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan, 1975.

DeLeonibus, N. Principal Attrition Survey Report. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals, July 26, 1979.

Edmonds, R. "Effective Schools for the Urban Poor" Educational Leadership, October 1979, pp. 15-27.

Edmonds, R., & Frederiksen, R. Search for Effective Schools: The Identification and Analysis of City Schools That are Instructionally Effective for Poor Children: Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, Center for Urban Studies, 1978.

Emrick, J., Peterson, F., & Agarwala-Rogers, R. Evaluation of the National Diffusion Network. Menlo Park, CA: Stanford Research Institute, 1977.

Federal Register, February 23, 1978

Gaynor, A. "The Study of Change in Educational Organizations: A review of the Literature." Paper presented at UCEA, Ohio State University Career Development Seminar. Columbus: May, 1975.

Goldhammer, K., Becker, G., Withycombe, R., Doyel, F., Miller, E., Morgan, C., Deloretto, L., Aldridge, B. Elementary Principals and Their Schools--Beacons of Brilliance and Potholes of Pestilence. Eugene, OR: Center for The Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1971.

Gorton, R., & McIntyre, K. The Senior High School Principalship. Vol. II. The Effecitve Principal. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1978.

Gross, N., & Herriot, R.E. Staff Leadership in Public Schools. New York: Wiley, 1965.

Havelock, R. et al., Planning for Innovation through Disseminatin and Utilization of Knowledge. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research, 1971.

Herriott, R., & Rosenblum, S. First Steps Towards Planned Change. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates Inc., 1976.

Hill, P., et al. The Effects of Federal Education Programs on School Princ pals Santa Monica, CA: Rand Corporation, February, 1980.

Jensen, C.S. "How Can We Boost IQ and Scholastic Achievement?" Harvard Educational Review, Winter, 1969.

Katz, E. & Lazarsfeld, P. Personal Influence. New York: The Free Press, 1955.

Kent, J. "The Management of Educational Change Efforts in School Systems." In Herriott, R., & Gross N. (eds.), The Dynamics of Planned Educational Change: Case Studies and Analysis. Berkely, CA: McCutchan, 1979.

Keys, C.B., and J. Bartunek. Organization Development in Schools: Goal Agreement, Process Skills and Diffusion of Change. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 15, 1979, 61-78.

Levenson, H. The Exceptional Executive: A Psychological Conception. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1968.

Lortie, D.C. School Teacher: A Sociological Study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Louis, K.S., Molitor, J., Spencer, G., & Yin, R. Linking R&D with Schools: An Interim Report. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates Inc., 1979.

Mangers, D. The School Principal: Recommendations for Effective Leadership Sacramento, CA: Task Force for the Improvement of Pre- and In-Service Training for Public School Administrators. 1978.

Mann, D. "The Politics and Administration of the 'Instructionally Effective School.'" Paper presented at American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, San Francisco, CA, April, 1980.

Maslach, C. "Burned Out". Human Behavior, September 1976, pp. 16-21.

McLaughlin, M.W. & Marsh, D. "Staff Development and School Change." Teachers College Record, Vol 80, No. 1, September, 1978, pp. 69-94.

Moore, D.R. et al., Assistance Strategies of Six Groups that Facilitate Educational Change at the School/Community Level. Chicago: Center for New Schools, 1977.

National Conference Report, 1977. National Conference Report, Teacher Corps Development Conference, 1977. Teacher Corps, U.S. Office of Education and the Center for Urban Education at the University of Omaha, Nebrasks, 1977.

Olivero,. J. "The Principalship in California: The Keeper of the Dream." The Association of California School Administrators, April, 1980.

Peterson, K. D., "The Principal's Task." Administrator's Notebook, Vol XXVI (77-78), No. 8. (published by Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago.) (periodical)

Peterson, V.T. "Response to Mandate: Organizational Implementation as a Loosely-Coupled Adaptation Process." Ph.D. Dissertation, Stanford University, 1976.

Pharis, W., & Zakariya, S. The Elementary School Principal in 1978: A Research Study. Arlington, VA: The National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1979.

Pincus, John "Incentives for Innovation in the Public Schools." Rand Note, 1973.

Roe, R.W. & Drake, T.L. The Principalship. New York: MacMillan, 1974.

Rosenblum, S. and Louis, K.S. Stability and Change: Innovation in an Educational Context. New York: Plenum Publishing Corporation, forthcoming.

Sarason, S. B. The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.

Sarason, S. The Creation of Settings and Future Societies. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.

Shepard, H. Innovation Resisting and Innovation Producing Organizations. Journal of Business, 40(4), 1967, 470-477.

Sieber, S.D., Louis, K.S., & Metzger, L. The Use of Educational Knowledge, Vols I and II. Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, 1972.

Simon, H. Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making Processes in Administrative Organizations. New York: Free Press, 1965.

Small, J.F. "Initiating and Responding to Social Change." In Performance Objectives for School Principals: Concepts and Instruments, edited by J.A. Culbertson, C. Henson, and R. Morrison. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing, 1974, pp. 18-53.

Spindler, G. (ed.). Education and Culture: Anthropological Approaches. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963.

Teacher Corps: Past or Prologue? National Advisory Council on Education Professions Development, Washington, DC: 1975.

Thomson, S., & DeLeonibus, N. "Why Principals Leave the Principalship." In National Bulletin, No. 431, December, 1978.

United States Congress, Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity of the United States Senate, 1974.

Weber, R. Inner City Children Can Be Taught to Read: Four Successful Schools. Washington, D.C.: Council for Basic Education, 1971.

Weick, Karl E., "Educational Organizations as Loosely Coupled Systems," Administrative Science Quarterly 21 (March 76): 1-19.

Weldy, G. Principals: What They Do and Who They Are. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1979.

Wilson, J. Innovation in Organizations: Notes Toward a Theory. In J. Thomson (ed.) Approaches to Organizational Design. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 1966, 193-218.

Wolcott, H. F., The Man in the Principal's Office: An Ethnography. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1973.

Zaltman, G., Duncan, R., and Holbeck, J. (eds.) Innovation and Organizations. New York: Wiley, 1973.

APPENDIX A
METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this section is to describe the methods and procedures that were used in the design and conduct of the study. The following topics will be discussed:

- site selection;
- issues related to the case study design;
- data collection procedures; and
- analysis and writing procedures.

Site Selection

The original mandate from Teacher Corps in Washington was to select four sites that were representative of the universe of Teacher Corps projects. The four project sites ultimately selected were chosen on the basis of several purposive and practical criteria. First, out of concern for respondent burden, sites were eliminated from consideration if they had been chosen as "intensive sites" or were in the Cost-Benefit Study in the national evaluation concurrently being conducted by SRI, or if they were being actively considered by the other case study contracts also in process. Secondly, only Program 78 projects were to be considered, since the Program 79 sites were just underway. Thirdly, true geographic representation was also eliminated as a site selection criterion due to the rising costs of air travel. Geographic spread was considered only to the extent that we selected no more than one project in any regional network.

Following this decision, Network Executive Secretaries in the eastern half of the country were contacted and asked to recommend candidate projects that would be appropriate in a study of the role of the principal in Teacher Corps. Projects were described and several were recommended. Individual Project Directors were then contacted and the study was described. Following discussion with other members at their local project site, agreement was reached, and four projects were chosen.

The four selected sites represented projects both new to Teacher Corps and previously involved, rural and urban, as well as other diverse factors such as programmatic focus, formal structures for involvement of principals, previous tenure of principals within the schools, leadership style of principals, and problem areas of the schools or districts.

The Design of the Case Studies

The key questions which the study was designed to address using a case study methodology were:

- How do principals act to facilitate or hinder the success of an innovative program which is collaboratively planned and governed, and which is to a large extent managed externally to the school?
- Why do some principals function effectively in such a context (i.e., lend support and leadership which facilite the achievement of program goals)?

The first of these two questions leads mainly to a description of the principals' roles in the respective Teacher Corps projects; the second to an explanation of successful principal involvement.

In organizing our inquiry to answer these questions, the project staff attempted to maintain an appropriate balance between understanding the complexities of the projects' operations, and continually striving to focus on the role and activities of the principal in support of those operations. In order to understand the latter, it was considered important to determine the context unique to each school and behavior of the principal in his/her own school in general.

Data Collection Procedures

Our approach to data collection was to form two-person teams for each site to review project documents and visit the site for two days in December 1979 and for three days in February 1980. Two persons were considered preferable to one (for a longer period of time) for a number of reasons. Discussion between two investigators allows for cross validation of findings and stimulates developmental insights and additional foci of inquiry. Further, it enabled each team member to participate in more than one case study, thereby allowing greater opportunity for insightful comparisons that would facilitate the search for explanations, synthesis and analysis across the four case studies.

We defined the first round of site visits as familiarization visits. Even though Network Executive Secretaries and individual Teacher Corps project directors were very informative by telephone about the scope and substance of the projects, those conversations and the project proposals

continuation proposals provided only limited documentation of the reality of the projects, and particularly of the role that principals have played in the projects over time. This was not surprising given the relatively undefined role for principals in the Teacher Corps Rules and Regulations, and in the formal structures of most projects. Thus the first visits were made fairly early in the contract in order to get a better understanding of the context and history of the projects and the principals' role within them.

During these visits, many individuals at the project and school level were interviewed. A field guide was prepared for site team members to insure that certain basic information needs were covered. This field guide consisted of topic agendas and an observational checklist covering such topics as community and school context, project context, principal background and behaviors, and principal's activities in the project. Interviews were informal, however, and every opportunity was taken not to be constrained by preconceptions of the relationships involved, and to allow for the "discovery" of reality in its natural setting. Some interviews were conducted by a single team member, others with both members of the team present. Further, wherever possible, site team members observed meetings and events that were taking place on site during the course of the site visits. These were considered very valuable in understanding the interpersonal and interorganizational relationships in the projects. After each day in the field, interview and field notes were recorded by each site team member.

The second visit was conducted approximately two months after the first, and whenever possible this visit was scheduled to coincide with particular events on site. The purpose of this second round of site visits was to build on the data collected during the earlier visit to gain a better understanding of the project and the extent and kinds of principal involvement. All of the visits were productive and Abt Associates' staff were received warmly by the project staffs, principals and other people associated with the projects. A total of almost 100 individuals involved with the Teacher Corps projects at the four sites were interviewed over the course of these visits. These included project staff members, principals, teachers, superintendents or other central office staff, deans, and community residents.

The substantial number of individuals interviewed (many of whom were interviewed two or three times) reflected the desire of the contract staff

to obtain a well-grounded understanding of how the project functions, and, in particular, how it interacts with and affects principals and schools. Although we concentrated on the principals and the project staff in order to obtain a comprehensive understanding of the project, we also interviewed individuals who could present different perspectives on the project. The second visit also served as an opportunity to verify our initial findings and interpretations.

Analysis and Writing Procedures

After each round of site visits was completed, an all-day debriefing session and "analysis seminar" was held which was attended by all field staff and by Dr. Terrence Deal, consultant to the project. The purpose of these meetings was to share experiences and insights obtained in the field and to develop an outline for the synthesis of the case studies. It was determined that the explanations for variations in principal involvement in Teacher Corps can be found both in project design and project management factors, and in differences in school context and administrative behaviors. Consequently, the case studies that were drafted as a data base for the synthesis and the commentary chapters provided detail on the following factors: the project context, the project design and major activities, the local school context, the background and administrative styles of the principals, and the interactions or involvement of the principals in the Teacher Corps project.

Drafts of the case studies for each site were written by the "team leader" for that site. In order to ensure accuracy and comprehensiveness, each case study author shared his/her draft of the case study with the other contract staff member who had also visited the site. The comments and additions suggested by this review were incorporated into a second draft of the case studies. As a further reliability check, each case study was sent to the appropriate Teacher Corps Project Director for his/her review for accuracy of fact and presentation.

The project specific case studies were viewed primarily as a data base for the synthesis, commentary chapters, and the Training Manual. For this reason, and to protect the anonymity of the sites, the project specific case studies have not been included in this report.

APPENDIX B
COMMENTARIES ON THE CASE STUDIES

Two experts in the fields of educational administration and organizational change were asked to review the preceeding materials and the project specific case studies and to provide commentaries, interpretations and recommendations for training. Each one, Dr. James Olivero (Association of California School Administrators) and Dr. Terrence E. Deal (Harvard Graduate School of Education), responded drawing upon his own disciplinary and experiential perspective.

COMMENTARY ON CASE STUDIES ON THE ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL

Terrence E. Deal

Managing a school under normal conditions is lonely, difficult, and uncertain. The principal is caught between conflicting agenda and expectations of teachers, parents, and the district office. Alliances with other principals are usually not developed fully. Connections among the activities of principals and others are loose or non-existent. Strategies for reaching goals are as elusive and amorphous as are the goals of education themselves. Whether the principal is accountable mainly for developing the instructional program and producing results or for maintaining discipline and running a tight ship is never that clear. And the authority of the principal is often undermined by teachers unions, contracts, specialists, and a tradition which fails to establish clearly the actual clout that principals might wield.

Enter a Teacher Corps project. In a variety of ways the event signals a change in normal conditions. The addition of new resources represents the positive side of the change. But in other ways a Teacher Corps project can make the overwhelming task of a principal even more difficult. A whole new cast of characters is introduced to the school. Two new agendas are added to an already lengthy list--those of the university and the project staff. Usually the agendas and goals of these groups are unclear and in the back of most principals' minds there undoubtedly lingers a suspicion--what do these people really want to do to my school? The project mobilizes parent groups, outlines initiative for instructional improvement, and calls attention to the climate of the school.

But how can a principal influence the course of these events? The channels available seem meager--representation of principals on policy boards is not mandated, the role of principals on steering committees is often ambiguous, and the connection between principals and community councils is usually minimal. As the principal's activities became more visible, demands on time increase, and old skills often do not work as they did before. But, training and support for principals does not always receive the same priority as it does for teachers, parents, or others. For a principal, a Teacher Corps project can often mean more loneliness, new difficulties, and more uncertainty in a position which already seems untenable. Add to this a

sobering message to principals that they are the key to a successful school--and a successful project--and it seems obvious that the present concern for principals in Teacher Corps is much needed and long overdue.

The purpose of this paper is to draw out some implications for training principals for a stronger role in Teacher Corps schools. I read the case studies of four projects from the viewpoint of someone who has experienced directly as a principal the pains of changing schools and who has since studied the process of change from the more detached perspective of a professor. From this experience/theory vantage point, none of the issues highlighted in the case studies were surprising. The four Teacher Corps projects read like most other case studies of change. The typical scenario is implied in most of the cases. Planning produces vague, symbolic agreement and important issues get buried. When plans move from the drawing board into action, conflicts arise, but most get avoided and smoothed over with the result that roles and efforts get separated and ambiguity increases. School principals have a difficult time knowing what to do or how to cope.

My approach to these typical issues of change is to emphasize the importance of structure and interaction among different constitutencies. Many of the problems of change are attributable to the fact that roles and responsibilities are unclear, expectations are elusive, and--without coordination--multiple efforts can easily become fragmented and conflicting. Additionally, in any effort to change something each group or constituency always has a different agenda. The central problem is that these conflicting agenda do not get reconciled into general agreements. Conflicts are often avoided or smoothed or conflicts are approached collaboratively even though the conditions for successful collaboration--namely, shared goals and mutual trust--are absent. Negotiation among constituencies is very rare even though this may be the most promising avenue for reaching mutual goals. In reading the case studies, problems of structure and the nature of the interaction among groups guided my reading. Partially as a result of this bias, these issues play a prominent role in this critical review.

From applying this perspective to the case studies several needs emerge. These needs provide some guidelines for administrative action but also suggest some implications for training and for Teacher Corps policies at a national level.

The needs, issues, and guidelines are lumped together in three separate categories: (1) how can principals of schools in Teacher Corps Projects exercise initiative to increase their effectiveness under existing conditions? (2) how can typical patterns in Teacher Corps Schools be altered to make it easier for principals to play a more integral role? and (3) how might Teacher Corps policies be altered to provide principals a stronger voice and greater influence? The main aim of the ideas in each category is to provide some direction for how the likelihood of Teacher Corps as a blessing can become greater than the likelihood of the project as an administrative headache. Principals themselves can exercise some initiative. But even more important, their efforts need to be supported by training, structure, and new policies.

Improving the Role of Principals Under Typical Conditions.

The case studies of four Projects suggest some conditions which are probably typical across Teacher Corps Projects. These conditions are not uncommon to other schools, but are probably accentuated by participation in projects such as Teacher Corps. The conditions are: uncertainty of purpose and of who is to be the primary beneficiary of resources, ambiguity of roles and relationships, and the lack of formal channels or arenas for making decisions, resolving conflicts, or reconciling differences. While these conditions can make it difficult for principals, examples from the case studies also highlight some opportunities that enterprising principals can pursue.

1. Principals can exercise considerable discretion in determining whether their school becomes part of Teacher Corps.

In one project, a principal was initially reluctant to participate in the Teacher Corp project but failed to register his concern forcefully. As a result the Project Director moved ahead with plans, not fully aware of the prinicpal's feelings. Principals have direct knowledge of themselves and their schools. This knowledge should play a major role in decisions about whether a school participates or not. Principals need not be timid about voicing their concerns.

2. Principals can influence planning if they participate in early stages of a project.

The importance of involving principals in planning for Teacher Corps is a recognized truism. But active involvement of principals in early phases does not usually occur. In one project, for example, principals were courted early on and their suggestions were solicited. But they were not actively involved in planning and thus felt deserted as the process moved along. Principals can assume a more active role in planning by calling attention to the commonly accepted notion that their early involvement is critical and taking the time to shape the project to deal with their own agenda. If principals are the key to school improvement, they ought to claim a stronger voice in determining directions for change.

3. Principals can shape the direction or profile of Teacher Corps projects once the project is underway.

Even if they are not involved in early phases of planning, principals can influence Teacher Corps objectives. Despite preliminary planning, most Teacher Corps projects will experience difficulties and uncertainties as plans move from the drawing board. Nothing ever works the way that it is intended. As projects enter transition stages, principals can take initiative in nudging the project in directions favorable to their own goals or aspirations. Several examples are noticeable in the case studies. In the Metropolis case, one principal took initiative in the steering committee by keeping minutes, encouraging the adoption of more formal procedures, and pushing for a chairperson selected from among school district participants. Principals also took initiative in altering existing workshops to fulfill the districts' commitment to the state to provide training for mainstreaming handicapped students. In Small Town, one principal took initiative in developing the concept of school-based consulting which eventually emerged to supplement university classes as a primary objective of the project.

By taking initiative principals can influence the profile and direction of a Teacher Corps project, particularly in times of crisis or when the mission is not fully understood by the project staff.

4. Principals can get their share of resources from Teacher Corps projects.

It is evident that the relationship between some Teacher Corps projects and principals is often governed by the rules of fair exchange.

Principals provide released time, substitutes and other intangible support. In return, the project staff honors the request of principals for resources they may need. In the southern rural project, for example, the project responded favorably to any request of principals for in-service training. In the Mid-Atlantic project, one principal was able to muster resources for teachers in the areas of value clarification and proposal-writing--even though it did not necessarily fit with the main goals of the project. In Small Town, one of the more assertive and active principals was able to obtain a substantial amount of resources for his school from the project. By making claims and actively seeking resources, principals may be able to use Teacher Corps to further important personal or school-wide goals--whether or not these fit with the main mission of Teacher Corps. This is particularly true when the mission of a Teacher Corps project is not specific or fully understood.

5. Principals need their own in-service training for a variety of reasons.

Although principals are seen as a key to Teacher Corps projects, they are often short-changed in training which might help them to become more effective.

In the Mid-Atlantic project one of the most notable features is the administrative in-service component. This component serves several needs of principals: it provides support, gives administrators an opportunity to share with peers and form a constituency of their own, and provides skills which are needed to manage more effectively.

Across projects, it is apparent that Teacher Corps projects increase the complexity of a principal's job and can often even do worse: make the position more lonely, make weaknesses more evident, erode the principal's authority, or create additional demands on already overloaded schedules.

Principals thus have a legitimate claim to in-service training. Such training needs to focus on areas such as: understanding Teacher Corps, understanding organizational change, managing time, managing or resolving conflicts, and coordinating through strategies other than personal authority or face-to-face meetings. By exercising initiative and making needs known principals may be able to rely more heavily on Teacher Corps resources for their own professional development. New administrative skills should also

prove useful to the project. Further details about the substance and process of administrative training will be outlined at the end of this paper.

From the case studies, it is clear that the conditions created by Teacher Corps projects do not always make life easy for principals. But it is equally obvious that under such conditions principals can exert influence by understanding the ropes, knowing what they want, and taking some initiative. By doing so, principals can increase their effectiveness without changing the circumstances surrounding a project. They can use existing conditions to their own advantage.

Changing Conditions to Improve the Principal's Role.

From the case studies, there are several examples of how principals can exert influence given the uncertainty and ambiguity which often accompany Teacher Corps projects. Less obvious, but equally important, is how principals (or others) might alter conditions to make their role more integral and effective. While knowing how to maneuver under existing conditions is always helpful, structural changes which accomplish the same ends may prove more effective--particularly in the long run. Several such changes are implied in the case studies or synthesis.

1. Principals in schools with a shared vision of issues and direction have a decided advantage in Teacher Corps projects.

It is important for principals to have a vision of what a school is and might become. But it is also important that the vision is shared among teachers, parents, and other important participants. For schools with a shared vision, Teacher Corps resources may be instrumental in converting dreams to reality. Principals who have created such visions are solidly established in their schools. They also have an advantage as Teacher Corps projects are planned and implemented. A shared vision provides clear directions and explicit agenda. Such agenda are helpful in making a project fit local needs; they also provide project administrators a basis for influencing the overall direction of the Teacher Corps project.

In the Mid-Atlantic project, for example, linking Teacher Corps resources to the local problem of competency-based instruction provided a mutually acceptable direction. Teacher Corps project resources were hooked to an existing momentum within the district; the thrust made Teacher Corps

resources instantly relevant. Efforts to encourage shared visions in schools prior to Teacher Corps planning may be useful both to principals and project staffs.

2. Clear channels between principals and project staff may be helpful in increasing the influence of both, promoting mutual understanding, and avoiding unnecessary conflicts.

Often, channels are designed to promote separations, rather than interaction and dialogue. In one project, the absence of clear channels between principals and the Teacher Corps project created confusion, distrust, and inhibited initiative since there was no recognized structure for initiating action or appealing decisions. Knowing who to talk with about what and the rules that govern the interaction can go a long way in reducing confusion, fostering security, and providing clear avenues for moving ahead. Additionally channels provide some guidelines for exerting influence or knowing how conflicts can be resolved. When principals don't know how to request resources or register concerns or a project staff does not know how to get clear signals about whether a given activity is feasible, a Teacher Corps project can quickly become estranged from a school.

3. Principals need to be connected directly with all Teacher Corps components.

Teacher Corps projects focus on individual schools. At the same time, the key individual in the school--the principal--is not always connected with each project component. In one project, for example, a separate facilitator is assigned to each component--instruction, parent council, etc. This results in the lack of integration particularly where it is needed most--at the local site.

Generating ideas and changes from individual components is worthwhile. Parent councils can survey needs. Instructional teams can develop new materials. In-service workshops can foster new skills. But these outputs need to come together and be sustained at the local site. Without a formal connection between the principal and these activities the likelihood of any connection is greatly reduced. Where principals were connected to components in the case studies the results looked promising. But, the connections were usually informal and serendipitous rather than systematic and planned.

4. Arenas for bringing diverse interests together are helpful and should always include the voice of principals.

Across the case studies, arenas for policy making, negotiating, and communicating vary considerably. In some projects, Mid-Atlantic for example, the policy board is composed of representatives from all important constituencies and is reasonably active. In other projects, Metropolis for example, a steering committee provides the arena in which all important interests can be registered and bargaining among groups can take place. Where such arenas exist they provide opportunities for conflicts to be resolved, agreements to be reached and policies to be mutually tailored to guide the project along.

But again, principals are not always included in these arenas and when they are, they often act as individuals rather than as representatives of the interests of principals as a group. As a result, the benefits are often individual, not project-wide.

Principals need to have a voice in all Teacher Corps project arenas, and their voice needs to reflect the interests of all principals who are involved. Without such representation the most crucial perspective is absent from policy making or bargaining with the result that policies or agreements will often not reflect the overall needs of a particular school or group of schools. Principals often complain about their levels of influence in contract negotiation even though they are ultimately responsible for administering the final product. Without representation in important arenas of Teacher Corps projects a similar problem arises and principals are deprived of understanding, influence, or input into programs they ultimately manage, implement, and reinforce.

5. Principals need some formal assurance that rocking the boat will not get them fired or demoted.

In some cases, there are examples of principals who are resistant to change and reluctant to take risks. While such sentiments are not always courageous, they may be exceedingly wise. A Teacher Corps project produces a natural level of uncertainty and conflict. Assurances of formal backing and informal support by the superintendent are important to principals who embark on a new course. Role descriptions which recognize risk-taking and evaluations which reinforce changes--even if they have not worked out--may provide security to Teacher Corps principals.

The first set of implications described above outlined some administrative strategies for principals in Teacher Corps schools where conditions are typical--at least as the four case studies suggest. The second set of strategies specified how these conditions might be changed toward greater certainty, structure, and interaction. These conditions may be altered by principals acting in concert or by project staff or district personnel who wish to strengthen the role of principals in Teacher Corps projects. The predominant philosophy is one which makes the principal an equal partner in negotiations that ultimately affect his or her school. While collaboration may be an important ideal, the diverse interests and natural tensions involved in Teacher Corps projects may favor bargaining strategies. In any event, the importance of regular interaction among constituencies seems evident--for a variety of reasons.

Some Policy Changes May Strengthen the Principal's Role.

While some of the conditions that hinder the effectiveness of principals in Teacher Corps projects can be skirted by assertive principals or altered within a local district, policies which contribute to such conditions need to be reviewed. If Teacher Corps wishes to have an impact on local schools, the role of the principal is widely recognized as pivotal. To strengthen the principal's role, these policy changes might be considered:

1. Mandate the representation of principals on the policy board.

The place of principals on this body is very important. And it is equally important that incentives are provided which promote interaction and give and take in the formation of policy to govern Teacher Corps projects.

2. Outline guidelines for interaction within the steering committee and other bodies.

While collaboration is important and desirable as a characteristic of relationships, the conditions which it requires are often absent. Mutual trust, shared goals, and power-parity are essential to collaboration. In Teacher Corps Projects, these conditions may be needed prior to establishing collaborative relationships. In the meantime, bargining and negotiating strategies can be encouraged and recognized as legitimate.

3. Outline some conditions which districts can follow to increase the involvement of principals.

The case studies highlight the importance of involving principals. By borrowing from the systems and case studies, some preliminary conditions may be established. These need to be communicated to districts and project staff.

4. Mandate training for principals as a component of Teacher Corps.

Each of the areas mentioned earlier--what principals can do under existing conditions or how existing conditions might be altered to make it easier for them to be effective--can be considered a source of ideas for what training might include. In addition, it may be helpful to think of the substance of training in the following ways.

Training should focus on skills principals need to perform their roles effectively. Many of these skills are mentioned or implied in the case studies. At a minimum, principals need skills in managing their time, communicating--orally and in written form--decision-making, resolving conflicts, giving and receiving feedback, planning, and delegating and monitoring authority. Existing materials can be used as a basis for training. But prior to providing training, weaknesses and strengths of individual principals need to be determined.

Training should provide principals with concepts for understanding the organization of their schools and of Teacher Corps projects. Administrators have a tendency to view organizations as collections of individuals and to emphasize individual traits and orientations as a source of problems and as a target for solutions. Throughout the case studies examples show that principals do not fully understand how organizations work--their own or the local Teachers Corps project. To help principals understand organizations more thoroughly, training needs to focus on structural concepts--how roles are defined and authority is delegated, different forms of interdependent working relationships, the conditions under which different forms work best and how they can be managed effectively, and various strategies for coordinating activities. Principals now seem to focus on coordinating through person authority or face-to-face interaction. They need to know also how to coordinate through policies, evaluation, planning, and informal monitoring.

There are a number of materials and ideas from the field of Organizational Development that may be used as a source for this training (see for example Deal, et.al., OD-ACSA or Carion). Training fo. principals also needs to include political concepts--interest groups, formation of coalitions, power--and various approaches to managing conflict--such as bargaining, collaboration, or the use of coercive power. Related to a political perspective is a growing body of symbolic concepts which may also help principals understand their organizations better. Again, there are existing materials which might be used as a basis for training that attempt to promote a comprehensive understanding of how organizations work.

Training should provide principals with an understanding of change. Changing organizations are accompanied by common pitfalls as well as some typical opportunities. Each style of change--planning, implementation, institutionalization--has its own set of issues that need to be resolved. Principals need to understand the stages of change, issues and problems that typically arise at each stage, how the resolution of problems at each stage can affect the next, and various strategies that can be used to deal with issues that will be likely to develop across the stages of change. Case studies of other Teacher Corps projects or other federally sponsored change activities (see for example Deal and Nutt, 1979) may be used as a way to promote a more intimate understanding of the dynamics of change.

Training should provide principals with a solid understanding of the objectives and structure of Teacher Corps. From the case studies, it seems fairly apparent that principals don't understand the objectives of Teacher Corps, how the project is structured, or how their efforts (or the general thrust of their schools) relate to those of the IHE or project staff. Preliminary phases of training for principals need to provide a comprehensive, fairly detailed picture of what Teacher Corps is trying to do, the strategies for reaching desired ends, and how the various components of the project are (or ought to be) related to one another. Again case studies of other projects may provide a helpful resource for giving principals a solid image of Teacher Corps aims and how these aims are translated into action in other settings.

Training should also deal with principals' attitudes toward change. Principals in some of the Teacher Corps sites seemed more fearful or resistant

to change than others. In addition, some principals' appeared much more willing than others to take risks or to exercise initiative. Attitudes of principals to change, risk-taking, or ambiguity provide another important focus for training.

Although training is important for principals, it is also critical for other participants in Teacher Corps projects. The process of training needs to include diverse participants and to get them talking and bargaining with one another. Many training activities will focus on individual principals--their skills, understanding, and attitudes. But it is also important that project directors, parent representatives and teachers have an adequate understanding of how organizations work, how the process of change unfolds, and what Teacher Corps is all about. Much of the training for principals needs to become training for everyone connected with the project. Such training needs to be conducted both within schools and within projects. By providing people with general concepts, case studies, and some guidelines for working on problems and issues, groups can negotiate their differences and reach some generally accepted agreement about where they are going and how. Training needs to reach everyone within a particular setting--not just principals.

Conclusion

Teacher Corps can be a blessing to principals; it can sometimes be a nuisance. Principals themselves can influence which of these options obtains --either by asserting themselves or changing typical conditions which make their role difficult. New policies which mandate a stronger role for principals and provide for substantial training early on may also help the principals exercise their important role more effectively. The case studies and synthesis provide some initial directions. The purpose of this critical review is to highlight those which appear most promising.

COMMENTARY ON CASE STUDIES ON THE ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL: IDEAS FOR TO PROJECT MANAGERS AND PRINCIPALS

James Olivero

The comments that follow are based upon a review of the four case studies constructed by representatives from Abt Associates for the National Teacher Corps (TC). I reviewed the studies as a former elementary, junior high, and high school principal, as a researcher in the area of school climate improvement (work primarily conducted through the C.F. Kettering Ltd. Foundations), as a project leader for administrative staff development, and as a consultant who has worked over the past several years with administrators involved in a variety of Teacher Corps projects.

The case studies, I believe, reflect quite accurately what actually occurs in many projects; indeed, they are more typical than atypical. While no single set of recommendations can be made about ways to make Teacher Corps more effective, there are several key concepts that run throughout the case studies--all worthy of further development. Unless some of these are taken into consideration, the ironic outcome that Teacher Corps functions best where it is needed least will be the rule rather than the exception.

Even though TC has been somewhat negligent in its consideration and concern for the principal's role in the project, TC should also be applauded for recognizing the key role the principal plays and searching for ways to help good programs become even better. While other programs (especially categorical programs) have focused attention on teachers and aides, very few have directed attention toward the upgrading of principal competencies. At the time of this writing, for example, less than one-half of one percent of the available federal dollars have been aimed at the enhancement of principal skills, attitudes, and knowledge.

The literature is replete with data regarding the "gatekeeper" role the principal plays; there is no need to repeat the scores of studies here. Suffice it to say that attention must be directed at the school principal (the neglected minority).

From the case studies, it is obvious that at least two prerequisites are needed if programs through TC are to be effective. First, both the project manager and the principal must have a clear orientation about TC--

what it is designed to do, the organizational structures that are inherent in TC, the past achievements that have been gained by TC, the resources that are available, the decision-making structure, the roles and responsibilities of everyone involved, and the ways that TC goals can be integrated into the school's goals. The orientation session(s) can help the principal realize TC isn't just a minor little project that is carried on outside the regular context of the school but it is, in fact, an integral part of the total school.

A thorough orientation is not only needed at the outset of the program, but the case studies reveal the need to have on-going orientation especially when project directors and principals inherit the visions of others. At best, inheriting another person's (or group's) dream is difficult. Having the responsibility to carry out someone else's ideasisn't an especially appealing one, particularly if the principal believes he/she is already inundated with court and legislative mandates (not to mention the day-to-day crises found in most schools).

An orientation is essential if the principal is to assume ownership (or at least collaborative responsibility) for the success of the project. And how can ownership be assured?

There are probably some principals who will never accept ownership, especially if they consider themselves as vulnerable to the rest of the world. While some principals can probably survive without causing waves, TC is a project which demands the creation of directed stress. To some principals, stress is a strong motivator--a motivator that brings out the best in performance. For other principals, however, directed stress causes distress --and a reasonably acceptable performance may quickly cause distress. Clearly, then, the principal who is least vulnerable is the one most likely to exert the leadership that is so necessary. By gaining clarification on the preceding issues (e.g., goals of the project; organizational structure; past achievements; decision making stuctures; roles and responsibilities; fiscal and human resources; and relation of TC goals to identified student and institutional needs), the principal is able to reduce his/her vulnerability.

Once ownership has been accepted and ground rules for the preceding issues have been resolved, most principals need specific skills to help them

move the project forward. Although not an all-inclusive list of skills, the principals need (at a minimum) the following:

- The skill to understand the entire gestalt of the school program.
- The skill to establish an operational philosophy within the school that points resources toward priority goals.
- The skill to develop a systematic game-plan to achieve the goals.
- The skill to gain the active involvement and support of diverse groups of people (individuals who possess a variety of agendas).
- The skill to understand the "change" process.
- The skill to recognize the consistency and/or inconsistency between leadership style and group expectations.
- The skill to communicate (verbally and in writing)--including conflict resolution skills--both face-to-face and where person-to-person communication is impossible.

This is a large order, but one that must be addressed. And it can be addressed if the superintendent and the board of education in a given district establish a positive climate for growth. A positive climate for growth has at least three characteristics that are especially valuable. First, the superintendent and the board need to let the principal (and others in the district) know that continued professional growth is both desirable and supported (by time and money). Professional growth expectations do not suggest that principals are incompetent; on the contrary, the superintendent and the board show by their actions that in the changing world of the school principal, he/she should continue to grow to meet those changing demands. Second, the growth should be personalized as much as possible. That is, some of the principals may need "all of the above," but there is a good possibility that many will already be competent in some of the areas. A personalized growth plan, then, becomes a tool for meeting personal needs, rather than an academic exercise. As illustrated in one of the case studies, principals interacting as collegial peers can provide an important support mechanism for this purpose. (Readers may wish to refer to the Kettering publications entitled SPAR and Building The Collegial Team. The first document illustrates a personalized professional growth plan that has been used extensively and effectively by principals in Project Leadership, a nationally recognized training program for principals. The second document--as the name implies --shows strategies and techniques for establishing a peer support group.)

TC lends itself very well to this type of administrative staff development initiative. TC, for instance, can help provide the consultant assistance --either through selected individuals from the IHE or from "outside" expert consultants. The collegial team, moreover, could consist of the individual principals from the project schools meeting together.

Finally, the district needs to establish a reward system that recognizes the achievements of the principal. Although the original document touches on the subject of incentives, additional brainstorming on this topic, including the principals who are affected, could have important results.

Now let's look briefly at the skills. The case studies show that some principals fail to understand how the TC efforts are a part of the "whole," and others perceive certain of the TC components as separate and discreet. With all of the demands that rain down on today's principals, getting a "handle on" the total gestalt is imperative. A principal needs to understand--and should have the ability to articulate--how each activity in the school is designed to achieve a particular goal. If any activity fails to focus on an identified goal, it (the activity) should not be implemented. The concept sounds reasonably simple, but it is one that demands considerable thought. A project as complex as TC can't be taken for granted. A relatively limited amount of time invested in planning how the activities support a philosophy often saves countless hours of wheel-spinning.

Naturally, a principal can't be cognizant of the gestalt if the school fails to develop an operational philosophy. An operational philosophy states (in writing) how a school focuses its resources to obtain specific outcomes. As strange as it may seem, many schools fail to have a simple, stated philosophy. Perhaps this is one reason that one principal in a case study failed to see how the TC climate improvement activities were related to the resolution of discipline problems in the school.

Unfortunately, too few principals understand the need to have a systematic game plan to get from "what is" to "what should be." A systematic plan that has proven validity is outlined in a publication (by Olivero) entitled "Organizational Development Through Interpersonal Trust." Part of any game plan clarifies who will do what, when. The case studies show numerous examples of individuals who apparently believe someone else is supposed to be doing something, but that something often goes undone. When

individuals don't agree on who? what? and when? there is a good chance that trust, cohesiveness, and positive morale will suffer. Certainly any plan needs to be flexible, allowing for in-flight alterations of direction, but as no pilot should take off on a journey without a flight plan, no principal should initiate any program in any school without having some reasonably good ideas about how to get from here to there.

Obviously TC recognizes the need for planning as an entire year is set aside for this purpose. Serious questions need to be asked, however, about whatever training, instruments or other interventions are used to assist with the planning because the case studies underscore the inadequacy of this factor. Understandably TC does not want to prescribe how local schools should go about the task of institutional improvement. I'm not suggesting prescriptions. What I am suggesting, though, are planning processes to help the principals and others concerned determine their own routes. Perhaps the statement is a little overly generalized, but the case studies tend to support the hypothesis that the principals who have had little experience with categorical programs are those who have the greatest need for the systematic planning skill. Perhaps a sentence or two of caution is valid. Care should be taken that any systematic plan does not become an end in itself--rather than a vehicle to help people move toward some defined outcomes. In some instances, people get so caught up in the process, they seldom take the action to achieve outcomes. To some extent, the case studies seemed to confirm this possibility in the TC projects. That is, some of the case studies illustrated numerous hours invested in the election of representatives to the Community Council, but then the Council had little, if any, idea about its purposes and functions--and power. The time and energy expended on getting the pieces together in the TC scheme of things has little pay-off if the Council never moves beyond the ceremonial status. A systematic plan, like the Community Council, is a necessary but not a sufficient tool.

Each of the case studies identified a "star" in the system who attempted to keep the project on target. Although the case studies identified a variety of stars who filled a number of different roles, a TC project is more likely to get the greatest mileage from its resources if the principal is the star at least at the school site. The star has a major responsibility for getting diverse groups to agree on common goals. Undoubtedly this

requires an understanding on the part of the principal about how groups work and about how people with divergent ideas can pull together toward common outcomes. Tony Carrillo at San Jose State University has prepared an excellent source book for TC describing how principals can work effectively with Community Councils; Olivero has prepared a document for principals illustrating the kinds of process skills (e.g., brainstorming, prioritizing, force field analysis, etc.) that are effective tools when working with students, staff, and/or community groups. Even if the principal decides someone else can be the star, the principal still needs to have the skill to know when voids exist and to either fill these in personally or to know where resources can be found to fill the voids. Getting and keeping people involved usually means transferring at least some responsibility and authority (power) away from the principal to other key members. Even though the responsibility may be transferred, the principal is still the person ultimately accountable for anything that transpires in his/her school. It is helpful, then, if the principal possesses the skill to know which people in different groups are initiators, which are maintenance oriented, and which are blockers. This skill is another principals can learn and use--and the case studies support the need.

Another skill needed by principals in TC project schools is that of understanding how the change process takes place. Many another have written eloquently on this topic and there is no need to review their work here. If TC, however, sees the project ultimately becoming institutionalized--as well as becoming diffused and disseminated to other sites--then principals are less vulnerable when they have a "handle on" the various steps of transition in the change process from awareness to institutionalization. Principals are also likely to feel more comfortable--especially those unfamiliar with special projects--when they understand the cyclical nature of projects, in checking the hassles related to changes in signals from project monitors, changes in attitudes of people associated with projects, and the inevitable problems related to funding and paperwork. Unfortunately, few administrative preparation programs give much attention to the change process; it is, therefore, a critical skill, especially when viewed in the context of an innovative program such as TC.

The case studies, show empirically, some of the most recent findings regarding leadership styles. Up until fairly recently, the general impression of those concerned about educational leadership supported a style as most effective. Some scholars described this as the professional-caring style, a style expected to generate both a high level of productivity and a high level of satisfaction. Only recently, however, has there come an awareness that a match between leadership styles and significant others' expectations is more likely to produce desired results than any single leadership style. Cawelti has written extensively on this topic and he also is an excellent consultant on the subject. Cawelti's explanation shows why the principal in the southern rural district is effective with one type of leadership style while the woman principal in the urban setting is also an effective leader. What this means to the school principal is knowledge about his/her leadership style and techniques to assess the congruence or lack of congruence between that style and expectations. The Purdue Opionnaire and the Firo-B instruments are tools the principal can use to gain a reasonable perception. When there is considerable disparity between expectations and behavior, the principal can draw upon the resources of TC to build in appropriate interventions. Unfortunately, we know much more about leadership style than we use.

Finally, the skills of communication and conflict resolution are essential. Communication includes a knowlege of a communication model, and specific skills related to both verbal and written competency. Although some principals are comfortable when talking with individuals, they are often very uncomfortable when communicating with groups--as in the case of the Community Council. As illustrated by the case studies, a couple of the principals were not articulate--a situation that can produce distress and a feeling of vulnerability. Too, some principals have a difficult time putting statements into writing, even though a majority of people with whom they communicate are those who receive only written communication. The problem posed is obvious.

In addition to the preceding skills needed by the principals, and to a lesser degree, by the Project Managers, a number of other issues need attention. I have chosen to list these in the following paragraphs although they are not outlined in any particular order of importance. (If the major issues described above receive attention, some of the band-aid matters pointed out below could be resolved.)

In the synthesis section of the Abt report there is a very cogent statement: "...by increasing the individual satisfaction and skills of principals, there may be ultimate institutional gains as well." This statement is the crux of administrative inservice; it is something most of us believe even though we have little evidence to support our conclusion. In any case, subsequent to the Mangers' Report on the Changing Role of the School Principal, a special task force was formed in the State of California to identify competencies possessed by effective principals. At least theoretically, principals in different settings (e.g., high school, elementary school, rural, urban, suburban) should identify those competencies they need to do their job--and cross check the competencies with significant others--to ascertain where growth is needed. TC can help bring the necessary resources to bear on this task. If not already available, a listing of human resources (on a regional or sectional basis--and including consultants from the IHE and within the district) could be a valuable asset.

The case studies in each of the four descriptions pointed out the weaknesses of the policy board, and to a lesser degree, perhaps (depending on the case), the Community Council. These two components can be very useful, but it is obvious they need considerable attention if they are to be worth more than their trouble.

In schools that have contracts with teacher unions, it is imperative for the principal to be fully cognizant of the district expectations for the management of the district contract at the site level as well as the informal expectations of the union. Contact management at the site is an onerous problem for at least two reasons: (1) many principals are not in on the negotiations and, therefore, interpret the contract differently than those in on the discussion, and (2) misinterpretations quickly result in grievances and incredible expenditures of energies resolving those grievances. Careful study of the district contract and TC expectations should be made prior to the school year. This review probably requires all of the key people associated with the project as well as the district's chief negotiator.

Finally, I saw very little evidence in the case studies that anyone associated with the projects had thought through--and agreed upon--indicators of success. Considerable discussion, for example, was given regarding school climate improvement, but no mention was made about evidence that would be

accepted illustrating the effectiveness of whatever interventions were chosen. This comment is not meant to be overly critical of TC; indeed, too few Project Managers and/or principals are familiar with program evaluation techniques. Without these guides, however, one can never be quite certain that whatever is tried is working or not. Ron Hockwalt has designed and developed a very valuable--and simple--training package to help administrators with program evaluation.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the following are offered as additional suggestions to project managers interested in fostering principal participation in projects. Although the suggestions are targetted to staff of Teacher Corps projects, the concepts apply to other school improvement projects involving a broad base of participants inside and outside the schools as well.

Consider the following:

1. Developing a "job description" illustrating expectations for the principal involved with Teacher Corps schools and for the other significant roles in the Project;
2. Developing a guide showing the authority and responsibility of and between such groups as the steering committee, the policy board, the Community Council, and the board of education;
3. Bringing together a small cadre of principals and other key role persons to develop a model "orientation" training program for people new to Teacher Corps;
4. Producing a brief descriptive document outlining past achievements made by Teacher Corps--perhaps principals would obtain a better idea about what could be done using Teacher Corps as a vehicle;
5. Developing a brief description of how principals can utilize the resources that are available through the Teacher Corps project;
6. Generating a list of issues or questions that would serve as guides during the planning year--it is difficult to come up with solutions if people don't know what questions to ask.

Changing behavior is a slow and difficult task; it doesn't happen overnight. But if our schools are going to be significantly better, the

leadership will need to be significantly different. Public education--and the teachers and administrators who have given so much to so many, need to be proud of their accomplishments, but they also need to find better ways to meet the challenges of today. TC offers one viable alternative for getting a "handle on" at least some of the challenges--and the key to an effective TC program, working in collaboration with significant others, is the school principal. As he/she goes, so goes the school--and also, so go the opportunities for a quality educational program for the boys and girls in the school. Hopefully the case studies and the subsequent analysis and suggestions will be looked upon as constructive criticisms aimed at making a good program even better. If this report leads to that end, it will have served its purpose.